arXiv:1508.06227v3 [math.AP] 16 Nov 2016

GLOBAL SOLUTION FOR THE 3D GRAVITY WATER WAVES SYSTEM ABOVE A FLAT BOTTOM

XUECHENG WANG

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the $3D$ water waves system above a fixed flat bottom (finite depth) with gravity, meanwhile without surface tension (the gravity water waves system). For this system, we prove global existence for suitably small initial data and non-existence of traveling waves below a certain level of smallness, which strongly contrasts the behavior of the solution of the same system in the $2D$ case.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Summary of the first paper and Main ideas of the proof 7
3. Some Lemmas 12
4. Analysis of Phases 16
5. The Set-up of The Improved Z-norm Estimate 20
6. The Improved Z-norm Estimate: Good Type Phases 25
7. The Improved Z-Norm Estimate: Bad Type Phases 33
8. Remainder estimate 53
References 56

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we study the long time behavior of the $3D$ gravity water waves system ($2D$ interface) in the flat bottom setting, which, to the best of author's knowledge, has not been addressed before. Due to the change from the infinite depth setting, which has recently been discussed extensively, to the flat bottom setting, the linear operator changes from the fraction Schrödinger $|\nabla|^{1/2}$ to the operator $\Lambda := \sqrt{|\nabla| \tanh(|\nabla|)}$ (the depth is normalized to be 1). Because of this change, a new type of difficulty arises, which is the cubic level degeneracy of phases at the low frequency part. At the low frequency part, the linear operator has the following approximation,

$$\Lambda(|\xi|) := \sqrt{|\xi| \tanh(|\xi|)} \approx |\xi| - \frac{1}{6}|\xi|^3, \quad |\xi| \ll 1,$$

which is wave-like at low frequency part. The problem we confront is the following quasilinear dispersive equation,

$$(\partial_t + i\Lambda)u = \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}} Q_{\mu,\nu}(u^\mu, u^\nu) + \mathcal{R}, \quad u : \mathbb{R}_t \times \mathbb{R}^2_x \to \mathbb{C}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $u^+ := u$, $u^- := \bar{u}$ and there is no null structure inside the quadratic terms $Q_{\mu,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$.

If the linear operator is half wave operator "$|\nabla|$", then it is impossible to prove the global solution for all small initial data and all type of quadratic terms. Since the quadratic terms do not have null structure inside, the solution blows up even for small initial data, see the work of John[26]. Unlike nonlinear wave equations, the phases associated with the quadratic terms do not vanish (except the trivial case), even when the frequencies of two inputs are parallel. But it is at cubic level smallness, which is still very bad. More precisely, the associated phases are defined as follows,

$$\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta) := \Lambda(|\xi|) - \mu\Lambda(|\xi-\eta|) - \nu\Lambda(|\eta|).$$

At the low frequency part, the following approximation holds when $|\xi|, |\eta| \ll 1$,

$$\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta) \approx [|\xi| - \mu|\xi-\eta| - \nu|\eta|] - \frac{1}{6}[|\xi|^3 - \mu|\eta|^3 - \nu|\xi-\eta|^3].$$

When $\xi-\eta$ and η are parallel, in the worst scenario, e.g., $|\xi-\eta| \sim |\eta| \sim |\xi|$, the size of phase is $|\xi|^3$, which is a cubic level smallness.

In this paper, we present a method to control all types of interactions at the low frequency part and get around this cubic degeneracy issue in $2D$. As a result, together with the result in our first paper [33], we show global existence of the gravity water waves system (1.1) in the flat bottom setting and non-existence of traveling waves below a certain level of smallness. We expect the method developed here can be applied to other models, for example, 3D gravity-capillary water waves in the flat bottom setting. At the low frequency part of these models, the associated linear operators are wave-like and the phases for quadratics terms have up to cubic level degeneracy (do not vanish except the trivial cases).

1.1. **Gravity water waves system above a flat bottom.** We first describe the problem setting. There is an incompressible irrotational inviscid fluid occupying a time dependent finite depth domain $\Omega(t)$, which has a free interface $\Gamma(t)$ and a fixed flat bottom Σ. The initial height of the interface is very small. Above the domain $\Omega(t)$, it's vacuum. We consider the effect of gravity and ignore the effect of surface tension. We normalize both the depth and the gravity constant g to be 1. We can describe the domain, the interface and the bottom in Eulerian coordinates as follows,

$$\Omega(t) := \{(x,y) : x\in\mathbb{R}^2, -1 \leq y \leq h(t,x)\},$$

$$\Gamma(t) := \{(x,y) : x\in\mathbb{R}^2, y = h(t,x)\}, \quad \Sigma := \{(x,y) : x\in\mathbb{R}^2, y=-1\}.$$

The evolution of this fluid is described by the Euler equation with boundary conditions as follows,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + u\cdot\nabla u = -\nabla p - g(0,0,1) & \\ \nabla\cdot u = 0,\ \nabla\times u = 0,\ u(0) = u_0 & \\ u\cdot\vec{\mathbf{n}} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \\ p = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma(t) \\ \partial_t + u\cdot\nabla \text{tangents to } \cup_t\Gamma(t) & \text{on } \Gamma(t), \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

As the velocity field is irrotational, we can represent it in terms of velocity potential ϕ. Let ψ be the restriction of velocity potential on the boundary $\Gamma(t)$, i.e., $\psi(t,x) := \phi(t,x,\ h(t,x))$. From divergence free condition and boundary conditions, we can derive the following harmonic equation with two boundary conditions: Neumann type on the bottom and Dirichlet type on the interface,

$$(\Delta_x + \partial_y^2)\phi = 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\big|_\Sigma = 0, \quad \phi\big|_{\Gamma(t)} = \psi. \tag{1.3}$$

Hence, we can reduce (see, for example [38]) the motion of fluid to the evolution of height "h" and velocity potential on the interface "ψ" as follows,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t h = G(h)\psi, \\ \\ \partial_t \psi = -h - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\psi|^2 + \dfrac{(G(h)\psi + \nabla h\cdot\nabla\psi)^2}{2(1+|\nabla h|^2)}, \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

where $G(h)\psi = \sqrt{1+|\nabla h|^2}\mathcal{N}(h)\psi$ and $\mathcal{N}(h)\psi$ is the Dirichlet-Neumann operator. For gravity water waves system (1.4), it has the following conservation law,

$$\mathcal{H}(h,\psi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{2}|h|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\psi G(h)\psi dx \approx \frac{1}{2}\big[\|h\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda\psi\|_{L^2}^2\big]. \tag{1.5}$$

1.2. **Main result.** Before stating our main theorem, we first define the function spaces that will be used constantly. Define the L^∞-type space as follows,

$$\|f\|_{W^{\gamma,b}} := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} (2^{\gamma k} + 2^{bk})\|P_k f\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \|f\|_{W^\gamma} := \|f\|_{W^{\gamma,0}}, \quad 0 \le b \le \gamma,$$

where P_k is the standard Littlewood-Paley projection operator, which will be defined precisely in the subsection 1.5.

Define the Z-normed space and the auxiliary space $B_{k,j}$ as follows,

$$\|f\|_Z := \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j\ge\max\{-k,0\}} \|f\|_{B_{k,j}}, \quad \|f\|_{B_{k,j}} := 2^{\alpha k}(1+2^{6k})2^j\|\varphi_j^k(x)\cdot P_k f\|_{L^2}, \quad \alpha = 1/10, \tag{1.6}$$

where the cutoff function $\varphi_j^k(x)$ localizes the physical position in a way depends on the localized frequency. More precisely, it is defined as follows,

$$\varphi_j^k(x) := \begin{cases} \tilde{\psi}_{(-\infty,-k]}(x) & \text{if } k+j=0 \text{ and } k\le 0, \\ \tilde{\psi}_{(-\infty,0]}(x) & \text{if } j=0 \text{ and } k\ge 0, \\ \tilde{\psi}_j(x) & \text{if } k+j\ge 1 \text{ and } j\ge 1, \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}(\cdot)$ is a standard bump function (see subsection 1.5 for details). We mention that this type of Z–norm was first introduced and used by Ionescu-Pausader in [22] for the context of Euler-Poisson/electron system case.

We use the following notation to include all possible combinations of k and j,

$$\mathcal{J} := \{(k,j)\in\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}_+ : k+j\ge 0\}.$$

From above definition, it's easy to see the following decomposition holds

$$P_k f = \sum_{j\ge\max\{-k,0\}} Q_{k,j} f \quad f = \sum_{(k,j)\in\mathcal{J}} Q_{k,j} f.$$

where the operator $Q_{k,j}$ is defined as follows,

$$Q_{k,j} f := P_{[k-2,k+2]}[\varphi_j^k(x)\cdot P_k f]. \tag{1.8}$$

Our main result is stated as follows,

Theorem 1.1. *Let $N_0 = 1000$ and $\delta \in (0, 10^{-9}]$ be fixed and sufficiently small. If (h_0, ψ_0) satisfies the following estimate,*

$$\|h_0\|_{H^{N_0+1/2}} + \|\Lambda\psi\|_{H^{N_0}} + \|(h_0, \Lambda\psi_0)\|_{Z\cap L^1} \leq \epsilon_0 \leq \bar{\epsilon}, \tag{1.9}$$

for some sufficiently small constant $\bar{\epsilon}$, then there is a unique global solution for the system (1.4) *with initial data (h_0, ψ_0), moreover, the following estimate holds,*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,\infty)} (1+t)^{-\delta}\|(h,\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{H^{N_0}} + (1+t)\|(h,\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{W^{4,2\alpha}} + \|e^{it\Lambda}(h+i\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_Z \lesssim \epsilon_0. \tag{1.10}$$

Remark 1.2. The top regularity N_0 can be improved after being more careful with the argument used in this paper. Since our goal is to show global existence and highlight main difficulties, we do not pursue the goal of optimizing the required top regularity here.

Remark 1.3. From (1.10), we can derive that there is no traveling wave below a certain smallness level determined by $\bar{\epsilon}$ in above theorem.

Remark 1.4. From the improved Z-norm estimate part (section 5), as a byproduct, we also know that the solution is scattering to a linear solution in a lower regularity Sobolev space, e.g., $H^5(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

1.3. **Previous results.**

Without being exhaustive on the progresses made so far on the water waves system, we only mention those representative results on the initial value problem. For the results on the blow up behavior of solutions and "splash singularity", interested readers may refer to [7, 14, 10] and references therein.

On the local theory side, Nalimov [29] and Yosihara [31] considered the small initial data case, Wu [34, 35] considered general initial data in Sobolev spaces, see also the subsequent works by Christodoulou-Lindblad [8], Lannes[27], Lindblad [28], Coutand-Shkoller [9], Shatah-Zeng[30] and Alazard-Burq-Zuily [2, 3]. If the effect of surface tension is also considered, local existence also holds, see Beyer-Gunther [6], Ambrose-Masmoudi [5], Coutand-Shkoller [10], Shatah-Zeng [30] and Alazard-Burq-Zuily [2, 3].

On the long time behavior side, we have several results. For the gravity water waves system in the infinite depth setting. In the $3D$ case, Wu [34] and Germain-Masmoudi-Shatah [15] proved global existence for small initial data. In the $2D$ case, see the work of Wu[35] and the work of Hunter-Ifrim-Tataru [20] for the almost global existence, see the work of Ionescu-Pusateri[23], Alazard-Delort [1], Ifrim-Tataru[20], Wang [32] for the global existence results. For the capillary water waves system in the infinite depth setting. See the work of Germain-Masmoudi-Shatah [16] for the $3D$ case.See the work of Ionescu-Pusateri [25] and Ifrim-Tataru [21] for the $2D$ case.

For the water waves system in the flat bottom setting. What we know so far about the flat bottom case can be summarized as follows: (i) on the one hand, the local existence holds (with bottom not necessary flat) by the work of Lannes [27] and the works of Alazard-Burq-Zuily [2, 3] and the large time existence holds, which is larger than what predicted by energy estimate, by the work of Alvarez-Samaniego and Lannes in [4]; (ii) on the other hand, the existence of traveling waves for initial data arbitrary small in L^2 level, which depends on the dimension and the ratio of the surface tension coefficient and the gravity constant.

The existence of traveling waves makes the problem of global regularity more delicate and more complicated. Traveling waves are more likely to exist in $2D$. In the $2D$ case, the traveling waves exist as long as $g \neq 0$ regardless whether σ equals 0 or not (see introduction part of [12] and references therein).

Meanwhile, in the $3D$ case, so far the traveling waves are only known to exist when $\sigma/g > 1/3$ (see [12]), i.e., the strong surface tension case.

As a contrast, from the main theorem, we know that there is no traveling waves under certain smallness level when $\sigma/g = 0$, i.e., $\sigma = 0, g = 1$. This result provides a sharp contrast for the fundamental difference of the behavior of small initial data solution between the $3D$ setting and the $2D$ setting.

1.4. **The full water waves system above a flat bottom.** The long time behavior of water waves systems in the infinite depth setting has been extensively studied recently. For the $3D$ case, the small data global solution problem has been completely solved, see the recent work of Deng-Ionescu-Pausader-Pusateri [13] on the gravity-capillary waves system in $3D$. However, we don't have any result on the very long time behavior of the water waves system in the flat bottom setting. As the first paper on the long time behavior of water waves system in the flat bottom setting, we discuss more about the full system in this subsection.

As a natural comparison, we compare the same system in the flat bottom setting with the infinite depth setting. In the infinite depth setting, after diagonalizing the system, we are dealing with the following type of quasilinear equation,

$$(\partial_t + i\Lambda_1)u = \mathcal{N}_1(u, \nabla u), \quad \Lambda_1 := \sqrt{|\nabla|(g + \sigma|\nabla|^2)}, \quad g, \sigma \geq 0, g + \sigma > 0. \tag{1.11}$$

Meanwhile, when changing to the finite depth (with depth normalized to be 1) setting, the behavior of Dirichlet-Neumann operator will change. After diagonalizing the system, we are dealing with the following type of quasilinear equation,

$$(\partial_t + i\Lambda_2)u = \mathcal{N}_2(u, \nabla u), \quad \Lambda_2 := \sqrt{\tanh(|\nabla|)|\nabla|(g + \sigma|\nabla|^2)}, \quad g, \sigma \geq 0, g + \sigma > 0. \tag{1.12}$$

The main difference of above two equations lies in the low frequency part. As "$\tanh x$" approaches to "1" very quickly as x goes to infinity, two settings are very similar for the medium and high frequency parts. The main difficulties arise in the infinite depth setting will also appear in the flat bottom setting. So we only highlight the main differences here and concentrate on the low frequency part.

On the Fourier side, the symbols of linear operators and their expansions around "0" are given as follows,

$$\Lambda_1(\xi) := \sqrt{|\xi|(g + \sigma|\xi|^2)}, \quad \Lambda_2(\xi) := \sqrt{\tanh|\xi||\xi|(g + \sigma|\xi|^2)}.$$

$$\Lambda_1(\xi) \sim \begin{cases} \sqrt{g}|\xi|^{1/2}, & g > 0, \\ \\ \sqrt{g}|\xi|^{3/2}, & g = 0, \sigma > 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.13}$$

$$\Lambda_2(\xi) \sim \begin{cases} \sqrt{g}|\xi| - \dfrac{g - 3\sigma}{6\sqrt{g}}|\xi|^3 + \dfrac{19g^2 - 30g\sigma - 45\sigma^2}{360g^{3/2}}|\xi|^5, & g > 0, \\ \\ \sqrt{\sigma}|\xi|^2 - \dfrac{\sqrt{\sigma}}{6}|\xi|^4, & g = 0, \sigma > 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$

For the system (1.11) and (1.12), their associated phases are given as follows,

$$\Phi_1^{\mu,\nu}(\xi, \eta) := \Lambda_1(\xi) - \mu\Lambda_1(\xi - \eta) - \nu\Lambda_1(\eta), \quad \Phi_2^{\mu,\nu}(\xi, \eta) := \Lambda_2(\xi) - \mu\Lambda_2(\xi - \eta) - \nu\Lambda_2(\eta).$$

It turns out that, the degenerated phase at low frequency part is a common feature for the water waves system above a flat bottom. From (1.13) and (1.14), we can see that $\Phi_2^{\mu,\nu}(\xi, \eta)$ is much more degenerated than $\Phi_1^{\mu,\nu}(\xi, \eta)$ in the worst scenarios. From (1.14), we can see that the linear operators are all wave-like for all possible value of g and σ except the case when $g = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$, in which it is Schrödinger-like.

As mentioned before, when $\sigma/g > 1/3$, there exists traveling waves in $3D$ case, which are arbitrary small in L^2 level. From the expansion (1.14), we can see the sign of $|\xi|^3$ change from "$-$" to "+" when σ/g changes from $1/3-\epsilon$ to $1/3+\epsilon$. As a result, the phase in the later case does not have a cubic smallness lower bound, but vanishes on a hypersurface of codimension "1". It is suggested that the case when $\sigma/g = 1/3$ might be a threshold for the full water waves system in the flat bottom setting. When $\sigma/g < 1/3$, the phases have the same cubic level degeneracy issue. By combining the method developed in this paper and the method developed in Deng-Ionescu-Pausader-Pusateri[13], it is reasonable to expect that the solution globally exists and decays for small initial data, hence no traveling waves below the certain level of smallness.

To know the full picture of gravity-capillary waves (with all possible values of g and σ as mentioned in (1.12)), it is helpful to know the long time behavior of the following two toy models with initial data u_0, s.t., $u_0 = P_{\leq 1} u_0$,

$$(\partial_t + i(|\nabla| + |\nabla|^5/90))u = \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}} P_{\leq 1}[|\nabla| Q_1(u^{\mu}, \nabla u^{\nu})], \quad \text{corresponds to } g=1, \sigma = 1/3, \tag{1.15}$$

$$(\partial_t + i(|\nabla|^2 - |\nabla|^4/6))u = \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}} P_{\leq 1}[Q_2(u^{\mu}, \nabla u^{\nu})], \quad \text{corresponds to } g=0, \sigma = 1, \tag{1.16}$$

and there are no null structures inside the quadratic terms $Q_1(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $Q_2(\cdot,\cdot)$.

Note that the non-presence of "$|\nabla|$" in (1.16) is not a typo. After diagonalizing the capillary waves system in the flat bottom setting, we do not see the presence of "$|\nabla|$" for some quadratic terms. Effectively speaking, we do not gain the smallness of output from symbols for the $1\times 1 \to 0$ type interaction. As a result, this drawback will add substantial difficulties to control the $1\times 1 \to 0$ type interaction. This fact is also another major difference between the flat bottom setting and the infinite depth setting. For the capillary waves system in the infinite depth setting, we do gain the smallness of output because cancellation also happens at low frequency level.

1.5. **Notations and The outline.** For any two numbers A and B, we use $A \lesssim B$ and $B \gtrsim A$ to denote $A \leq CB$, where C is an absolute constant. We use $A \sim B$ to denote the case when $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$. We use $A \approx B$ if $|A-B| \ll A$.

Throughout this paper, we will abuse notation of "Λ" a little bit. When there is no lower script in Λ, then $\Lambda := \sqrt{\tanh(|\nabla|)|\nabla|}$, which is the linear operator associated for the system (1.4). When there is a lower script p in Λ where $p\in\mathbb{N}_+$, then we use $\Lambda_p(\mathcal{N})$ to denote the p-th order terms of the nonlinearity $\mathcal{N}$ if a Taylor expansion of $\mathcal{N}$ is available. Also, we use notation $\Lambda_{\geq p}[\mathcal{N}]$ to denote the p-th and higher orders terms. More precisely, $\Lambda_{\geq p}[\mathcal{N}] := \sum_{q\geq p}\Lambda_q[\mathcal{N}]$. For example, $\Lambda_2[\mathcal{N}]$ denotes the quadratic term of $\mathcal{N}$ and $\Lambda_{\geq 2}[\mathcal{N}]$ denotes the quadratic and higher order terms of $\mathcal{N}$. If there is no special annotation, then Taylor expansions are in terms of h and ψ.

We fix an even smooth function $\tilde{\psi}: \mathbb{R}\to[0,1]$ supported in $[-3/2, 3/2]$ and equals to 1 in $[-5/4, 5/4]$. For any $k\in\mathbb{Z}$, we define

$$\psi_k(x) := \tilde{\psi}(x/2^k) - \tilde{\psi}(x/2^{k-1}), \quad \psi_{\leq k}(x) := \tilde{\psi}(x/2^k) = \sum_{l\leq k}\psi_l(x), \quad \psi_{\geq k}(x) := 1 - \psi_{\leq k-1}(x),$$

and use P_k, $P_{\leq k}$ and $P_{\geq k}$ to denote the projection operators by the Fourier multipliers ψ_k, $\psi_{\leq k}$ and $\psi_{\geq k}$ respectively. For a well defined function $f(x)$, we use $f_k(x)$ to abbreviate $P_k f(x)$ and use $f_{k,j}(x)$ to abbreviate $Q_{k,j} f(x)$. Recall that the operator $Q_{k,j}$ is defined in (1.8).

We use both $\widehat{f}(\xi)$ and $\mathcal{F}(f)(\xi)$ to denote the Fourier transform of f, which is defined as follows,

$$\mathcal{F}(f)(\xi) = \int e^{-ix\cdot\xi} f(x) dx.$$

We use $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(g)$ to denote the inverse Fourier transform of $g(\xi)$. For an integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we use k_+ to denote $\max\{k, 0\}$ and use k_- to denote $\min\{k, 0\}$. For two well defined functions $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ and a bilinear form $Q(f, g)$, we use the convention that the symbol $q(\cdot, \cdot)$ of $Q(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined in the following sense throughout this paper,

$$\mathcal{F}[Q(f,g)](\xi) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widehat{f}(\xi - \eta)\widehat{g}(\eta) q(\xi - \eta, \eta) d\eta. \tag{1.17}$$

Very similarly, for a trilinear form $C(f, g, h)$, its symbol $c(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ is defined in the following sense,

$$\mathcal{F}[C(f,g,h)](\xi) = \frac{1}{16\pi^4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widehat{f}(\xi - \eta)\widehat{g}(\eta - \sigma)\widehat{h}(\sigma) c(\xi - \eta, \eta - \sigma, \sigma) d\eta d\sigma.$$

Define a class of symbol and its associated norms as follows,

$$\mathcal{S}^\infty := \{m : \mathbb{R}^4 \,\text{or}\, \mathbb{R}^6 \to \mathbb{C}, m \,\text{is continuous and} \quad \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(m)\|_{L^1} < \infty\},$$

$$\|m\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty} := \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(m)\|_{L^1}, \quad \|m(\xi, \eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} := \|m(\xi, \eta)\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi - \eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty},$$

$$\|m(\xi, \eta, \sigma)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2,k_3}} := \|m(\xi, \eta, \sigma)\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi - \eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta - \sigma)\psi_{k_3}(\sigma)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty}.$$

In section 2, we summarize the main results in our first paper, in which we derived a new energy estimate and studied properties of Dirichlet-Neumann operator for the purpose of studying long time behavior. In section 3, we record some lemmas and prove some angular localized type bilinear estimates, which are very important for later argument. In section 4, we analyze properties of phases associated with system (1.4). In section 5, we introduce the set-up of how to derive the improved Z-norm estimate of the profile and decompose the quadratic terms into good type terms and bad type terms based on the behavior of associated phases. In section 6 and section 7, we derive the improved Z-norm estimate for the good type terms and bad type terms respectively by assuming the Z-norm estimate for remainder term holds and finish the proof of Proposition 5.3. In section 8, we derive Z-norm estimate for the remainder term and finish the proof of Proposition 5.2.

Acknowledgement I thank my Ph.D advisor Alexandru Ionescu for many helpful discussions and suggestions. The first version of manuscript was done when I was visiting Fudan University and BICMR, Peking University. I thank Zhen Lei and BICMR for their warm hospitalities during visit.

2. SUMMARY OF THE FIRST PAPER AND MAIN IDEAS OF THE PROOF

Since the local existence of the system (1.4) is already known(for example, see [3]), it is very natural to use the bootstrap argument to iterate the local result. The argument is reduced to estimate the energy and the dispersion of the nonlinear solution.

Due to the cubic degeneracy issue of phases at the low frequency part, it is not hopeful to prove that the $L^\infty-$ norm of the solution has the sharp $1/(1 + t)$ decay rate over time. As a result, a rough energy estimate is not sufficient to control the growth of energy in the long run. To get around this issue, instead of working too hard, it turns out that there is a relatively simple way to control the growth of energy. It relies on the following two observations: (i) A new type of energy estimate is available after carefully studying the Dirichlet-Neumann operator and the quadratic terms of the system (1.4).

Intuitively speaking, L^∞ norm part of the new energy estimate only depends on the derivative of solution. (ii) Although it is not hopeful to prove general solutions decay sharply, we can prove that the solution with some degree of derivatives in front decays sharply. The derivative at low frequency part compensates decay rate.

The new energy estimate is one of main results in our first paper [33], in which we studied the local behavior of the system (1.4) for the purpose of studying the long time behavior. For readers' convenience, we summarize the main results in the following subsection.

2.1. **The new energy estimate and properties of Dirichlet-Neumann operators.** The smallness assumption assumed in [33] is weaker than the smallness assumption (1.9), only W^4-norm of initial data is required to be small. Hence, we can use the new energy estimate derived there directly. The new energy estimate derived in [33] can be stated as follows,

Theorem 2.1. *If initial data* $(h_0, \Lambda\psi_0) \in H^{N_0+1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2) \times H^{N_0}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *satisfies the smallness condition* (1.9)*, then there exists some* $T > 0$ *and a unique solution* $(h, \Lambda\psi) \in C^0\big([0,T]; H^{N_0}(\mathbb{R}^2) \times H^{N_0}(\mathbb{R}^2)\big)$. *Moreover, the following energy estimate holds for any* $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\|(h, \Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{H^{N_0}}^2 \lesssim_{N_0} \epsilon_0^2 + \int_0^t \big[\|(h,\Lambda\psi)(s)\|_{W^{4,1}} + \|(h,\Lambda\psi)(s)\|_{W^4}^2\big]\|(h,\Lambda\psi)(s)\|_{H^{N_0}}^2\, ds. \quad (2.1)$$

There are two main ingredients to derive (2.1): (i) Careful estimates of the Dirichlet-Neumann operator with attentions to the low frequency part of quadratic terms. (ii) Thanks to the works of Alazard-Burq-Zuily [2, 3]. We can use their paralinerarization and sysmetrization procedures to avoid losing derivatives at the high frequency part.

To study and estimate the Dirichlet-Neumann operator, we formulate the velocity potential in a fixed point type formulation. More precisely, we map the water region $\Omega(t)$ to the strip $\mathcal{S} := \mathbb{R}^2 \times [-1, 0]$ as follows,

$$(x,y) \to (x,z), \quad z := \frac{y - h(t,x)}{h(t,x)+1}, \quad z \in [-1,0].$$

Let $\varphi(x,z) := \phi(x, h + (h+1)z)$. From (1.3), the following identity holds,

$$(\Delta_x + \partial_y^2)\phi = 0 \Longrightarrow P\varphi := [\Delta_x + \tilde{a}\partial_z^2 + \tilde{b}\cdot\nabla\partial_z + \tilde{c}\partial_z]\varphi = 0, \varphi\big|_{z=0} = \psi, \partial_z\varphi\big|_{z=-1} = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$\tilde{a} = \frac{1+(z+1)^2|\nabla h|^2}{(1+h)^2}, \tilde{b} = \frac{-2(z+1)\nabla h}{1+h}, \quad \tilde{c} = \frac{-(z+1)\Delta_x h}{(1+h)} + 2\frac{(z+1)|\nabla h|^2}{(1+h)^2}. \quad (2.3)$$

The Dirichlet-Neumann operator in terms of φ is given as follows,

$$G(h)\psi = [-\nabla h\cdot\nabla\phi + \partial_y\phi]\big|_{y=h} = \frac{1+|\nabla h|^2}{1+h}\partial_z\varphi\big|_{z=0} - \nabla\psi\cdot\nabla h, \quad (2.4)$$

Therefore, to estimate $G(h)\psi$ in a X-normed space, it is sufficient to estimate $\partial_z\varphi$ in the $L_z^\infty X$-normed space. We will use (2.2) to see the fixed-point structure of $\nabla_{x,z}\varphi$, which provides a good way to estimate $\partial_z\varphi$ and determine the Taylor expansion of the Dirichlet-Neumann operator.

We decompose the equation (2.2) as follows,

$$(\partial_z + |\nabla|)(\partial_z - |\nabla|)\varphi = (1-\tilde{a})\partial_z^2\varphi - \tilde{b}\cdot\nabla\partial_z\varphi - \tilde{c}\partial_z\varphi = g(z) = \partial_z g_1(z) + g_2(z) + \nabla\cdot g_3(z),$$

where

$$g_1(z) = \frac{2\,h + h^2 - (z+1)^2|\nabla h|^2}{(1+h)^2}\partial_z\varphi + \frac{(z+1)\nabla h\cdot\nabla\varphi}{1+h}, \quad g_1(-1)=0, \tag{2.5}$$

$$g_2(z) = \frac{(z+1)|\nabla h|^2\partial_z\varphi}{(1+h)^2} - \frac{\nabla h\cdot\nabla\varphi}{1+h}, \quad g_3(z) = \frac{(z+1)\nabla h\partial_z\varphi}{1+h}. \tag{2.6}$$

The point of above decomposition is that we can solve it explicitly by treating the nonlinearity $g(z)$ as given. Since $g(z)$ has a term of type "$\partial_z^2\varphi$", which is not in terms of $\nabla_{x,z}\varphi$. Hence we decompose $g(z)$ further as $\partial_z g_1(z) + g_2(z) + \nabla\cdot g_3(z)$ and do integration by parts in "z" once for $g_1(z)$. From (2.5) and (2.6), we can see that $g_i(z)$, $i\in\{1,2,3\}$ are all linearly depend on $\nabla_{x,z}\varphi$, therefore lies in the fixed point structure. In the end of day, we have the following fixed point type formulation for $\nabla_{x,z}\varphi$,

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{x,z}\varphi = &\left[\Big[\frac{e^{-(z+1)|\nabla|}+e^{(z+1)|\nabla|}}{e^{-|\nabla|}+e^{|\nabla|}}\Big]\nabla\psi, \frac{e^{(z+1)|\nabla|}-e^{-(z+1)|\nabla|}}{e^{-|\nabla|}+e^{|\nabla|}}|\nabla|\psi\right] + [\mathbf{0}, g_1(z)] + \\ &+ \int_{-1}^{0}[K_1(z,s)-K_2(z,s)-K_3(z,s)](g_2(s)+\nabla\cdot g_3(s))ds \\ &+ \int_{-1}^{0} K_3(z,s)|\nabla|\text{sign}(z-s)g_1(s) - |\nabla|[K_1(z,s)+K_2(z,s)]g_1(s)\,ds, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where $K_i(z,s)$, $i\in\{1,2,3\}$ are some linear operators. Their detailed formulas are not so relevant for the intuitive purpose, but one can see [33] for their detail formulas. From (2.7) and (2.4), it's easy to see that the linear terms of $\nabla_{x,z}\varphi$ and $G(h)\psi$ are given as follows,

$$\Lambda_1[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi] = \left[\Big[\frac{e^{-(z+1)|\nabla|}+e^{(z+1)|\nabla|}}{e^{-|\nabla|}+e^{|\nabla|}}\Big]\nabla\psi, \frac{e^{(z+1)|\nabla|}-e^{-(z+1)|\nabla|}}{e^{-|\nabla|}+e^{|\nabla|}}|\nabla|\psi\right], \tag{2.8}$$

$$\Lambda_1[G(h)\psi] = |\nabla|\tanh(|\nabla|)\psi.$$

As the decay rate is critical in the 3D setting ($2D$ interface), to know the long time behavior of the dispersive equation (1.1), it's crucial to know what type of quadratic term we are dealing with. Essentially speaking, we only need to know what the quadratic terms of $G(h)\psi$ are.

We can plug in the linear terms of $\nabla_{x,z}\varphi$ in (2.8) to (2.7) to find out what quadratic terms of $\partial_z\varphi$ are, which further give us the quadratic terms of $G(h)\psi$ from (2.4). As a result, we have the following Lemma on the symbol of quadratic terms of $G(h)\psi$, which can be found in [33][Lemma 3.5],

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\widetilde{q}(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the symbol of quadratic terms of $G(h)\psi$, for $k_1, k_2, k\in\mathbb{Z}$, we have the following estimate on symbol,*

$$\|\widetilde{q}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} \lesssim 2^{k+k_2}. \tag{2.9}$$

We also need to show that the cubic and higher order terms "$\mathcal{R}$" of equation (1.1) do not have much accumulated effects in the long run, essentially speaking it is sufficient to control $\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]$. It turns out that the fixed point type formulation (2.7) is also a powerful tool to estimate those cubic and higher order terms. We can represent $\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]$ as the following fixed point type formulation (see [33][Lemma 3.7]),

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi] = &\sum_{i=1,2} C_z^i(h,\psi,\tilde{h}_i) + h\tilde{C}_z^i(h,\psi,\tilde{h}_i) + (1+h)^2\tilde{C}_z(\tilde{h}_2,\tilde{h}_2,\Lambda_{\leq 2}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]) + h^2\hat{C}_z(h,\tilde{h}_2,\psi) \\ &+ T_z^i(\tilde{h}_i,\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]) + \widetilde{C}_z^1(h,\tilde{h}_2,\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]) + (1+h)^2\widetilde{C}_z^2(\tilde{h}_2,\tilde{h}_2,\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]),\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where C_z^i, $\tilde{C}_z^i$, $\tilde{C}_z$, $\hat{C}_z$, $\widetilde{C}_z^i$, $i \in \{1,2\}$ are some trilinear operators, T_z^i is some bilinear operators and $\tilde{h}_1$ and $\tilde{h}_2$ are given as follows,

$$\tilde{h}_1 = \frac{2h + h^2}{(1+h)^2}, \quad \tilde{h}_2 = \frac{h}{1+h}.$$

The symbols of bilinear operators T_z^i satisfy the estimate (8.15), symbols of all above trilinear operators satisfy the estimate (8.16). We will use above fixed point type formulation to estimate remainder terms "$\mathcal{R}$" in section 8.

2.2. **Main ideas of proof.** From the new energy estimate (2.1) in Theorem 2.1, it would be sufficient to close argument if one can prove that the decay rate of the nonlinear solution in $W^{4,2\alpha}$ space is sharp, which is $1/(1+t)$ over time. From the linear decay estimates in Lemma 3.4, we can reduce the question into controlling the L^1-type norm of the profile of solution over time to get sharp decay rate. However, there is no associated scaling vector field [1] available for the system of type (1.1) to help us to control the weighted norm. After observing structures inside the phases and the quadratic terms, we choose the Z-norm as defined in (1.6), which is essentially a weighted norm of L^2 type. An advantage of using this Z-normed space is that we can localize both the spatial position and the frequency.

From the choice of our Z-norm, we can reduce the dispersion estimate of solution in $W^{4,2\alpha}$ space to the Z–norm estimate of the associated profile of solution. Our main goal is reduced to prove that the Z–norm of the profile doesn't grow in time and has the size of initial data. Although the idea is straightforward, it is extremely delicate to derive the improved Z–norm estimate. Since there are have many very bad scenarios, we need to utilize different strategies for different scenarios.

Although this question is very complicated at technical level, we mention three key observations that make it possible to close the argument. First key observation is that, we can decompose the phases into two parts which have the same sign. For example,

$$\Lambda(|\xi|) - \Lambda(|\xi+\eta|) + \Lambda(|\eta|) = \underbrace{\Lambda(|\xi|) - \Lambda(|\xi| + |\eta|) + \Lambda(|\eta|)}_{\text{Positive}} + \underbrace{\Lambda(|\xi| + |\eta|) - \Lambda(|\xi+\eta|)}_{\text{Positive}}.$$

Because of this, we have a lower bound for the sizes of phases despite they are of cubic level smallness. Essentially speaking, the same sign property holds because $\Lambda(|\xi|)$ is an increasing function and $\Lambda''(|\xi|)$ is a decreasing function.

Second key observation is that, we can gain one degree of smallness of output in the $1 \times 1 \to 0$ interaction case, see (3.11) in Lemma 3.3. Although this smallness is not strong enough to control completely the accumulated $1 \times 1 \to 0$ type interaction effect over time but it makes the choice of small "α" in the definition of Z-norm possible. The choice of small "α" is important, because of the two facts: (i) the gain from the choice of α in the $1 \times 1 \to 0$ type interaction corresponds to the loss from the choice of α in the $0 \times 1 \to 1$ type interaction; (ii) we do not have null structure in the Low × High type interaction, as the size of symbol is like 1 in the $0 \times 1 \to 1$ type interaction. Also because we can gain one degree of smallness of output, it makes the improved L^2 estimate possible, see (5.20) in Lemma 5.4. This improved L^2 estimate is very curcial for the case when we can not do integration by parts in time or not do integration by parts in "η". For example, see the case in subsubsection 7.1.2.

Third key observation is that, the angle between the output and the smaller input is proportional to the angle between the two inputs when the phase is highly degenerated. This fact does not hold for the phase which is not highly degenerated, but we do not need this fact for the non-highly degenerated phases.

---

[1] We do have the rotational vector field, but it is not very helpful without the company of scaling vector field for this case.

To see above observation, we use the phase $\Phi^{+,-}(\xi,\eta)$ and the case when $|\eta| \ll |\xi|$ as an example. Intuitively speaking, note that $\Lambda(|\xi|)$ can be approximated by $|\xi| - |\xi|^3/6$ with error of size $|\xi|^5$ when $|\xi| \ll 1$, we have the approximation as follows,

$$\Phi^{+,-}(\xi,\eta) = \Lambda(|\xi|) - \Lambda(|\xi-\eta|) + \Lambda(|\eta|) \approx [|\xi| - |\xi-\eta| + |\eta|] - \frac{1}{6}[|\xi|^3 + |\eta|^3 - |\xi-\eta|^3]$$
$$= \frac{|\xi||\eta|(1+\cos(\xi,\eta))}{|\xi| + |\xi-\eta| + |\eta|} - \frac{1}{6}[|\xi|^3 + |\eta|^3 - |\xi-\eta|^3], \quad |\xi|, |\xi-\eta|, |\eta| \ll 1. \tag{2.11}$$

From above approximation, we can see that the size of phase is of linear level smallness, which is not so small, if the angle between ξ and $-\eta$ is not small. The size of phase is of cubic level smallness, which is the worst scenario, if ξ and $-\eta$ is almost in the same direction. That is to say, the size of phase highly depends on the angle between "ξ" and "η" for the case that we are considering. Note that

$$\nabla_\xi \Phi^{+,-}(\xi,\eta) \approx \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} - \frac{\xi-\eta}{|\xi-\eta|} = \angle(\xi, \xi-\eta), \quad \nabla_\eta \Phi^{+,-}(\xi,\eta) \approx -\frac{\eta-\xi}{|\eta-\xi|} + \frac{\eta}{|\eta|} = \angle(\xi-\eta, -\eta).$$

Recall that $|\eta| \ll |\xi|$. Therefore, if ξ and $-\eta$ are almost in the same direction, then ξ and $\xi-\eta$ are almost in the same direction and $\xi-\eta$ and $-\eta$ are almost in the same direction. That is to say, the sizes of $\nabla_\xi \Phi^{+,-}(\xi,\eta)$, $\nabla_\eta \Phi^{+,-}(\xi,\eta)$ and $\Phi^{+,-}(\xi,\eta)$ are all connected through the angle between ξ and $-\eta$.

Hence, we will localize the angle between the output and one of two inputs for the case of degenerated phases. The small angle helps in most of cases. But one has to be very careful about doing estimates and doing integration by parts in "η" after localizing the angle, as the symbol behaves very badly when the derivative "∇_η" hits the symbol.

2.3. **Bootstrap assumption and proof of the main theorem.** We will prove our main theorem via the standard bootstrap argument. The bootstrap assumption is as follows,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} (1+t)^{-\delta}\|(h,\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{H^{N_0}} + (1+t)\|(h,\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{W^{4,2\alpha}} + \|e^{it\Lambda}(h+i\Lambda\psi)\|_Z \lesssim \epsilon_1 := \epsilon_0^{5/6}. \tag{2.12}$$

We split the argument into two parts, which corresponding to the following two propositions.

Proposition 2.3. *Under the bootstrap assumption* (2.12), *we have the following estimate,*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} (1+t)^{-\delta}\|(h,\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{H^{N_0}} \lesssim \epsilon_0. \tag{2.13}$$

Proof. Note that the following estimate holds under the bootstrap assumption (2.12),

$$\|(h,\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{W^4} \lesssim \|(h,\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{H^{N_0}}^{1/4} \|(h,\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{W^{4,2\alpha}}^{3/4} \lesssim (1+t)^{-3/4+2\delta}\epsilon_0.$$

From (2.1) in Theorem 2.1, the following estimate holds for any $t\in[0,T]$,

$$\|(h,\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{H^{N_0}}^2 \lesssim \epsilon_0^2 + \int_0^t \frac{\epsilon_1^3}{(1+s)^{1-2\delta}} ds \lesssim (1+t)^{2\delta}\epsilon_0^2.$$

Hence (2.13) holds. □

The rest of this paper is devoted to prove the following Proposition, which is sufficient to close the bootstrap argument.

Proposition 2.4. *Under the bootstrap assumption (2.12) and the energy estimate (2.13), we have*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} (1+t)\|(h,\Lambda\psi)(t)\|_{W^{4,2\alpha}} + \|e^{it\Lambda}(h+i\Lambda\psi)\|_Z \lesssim \epsilon_0. \tag{2.14}$$

3. SOME LEMMAS

We have the following lemma on the multilinear estimates,

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that* m, $m' \in S^{\infty}$, $p, q, r, s \in [1, \infty]$ *, then the following estimates hold for well defined functions* $f(x), g(x)$, *and* $h(x)$,

$$\|m \cdot m'\|_{S^{\infty}} \lesssim \|m\|_{S^{\infty}} \|m'\|_{S^{\infty}}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\Big\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} m(\xi,\eta)\widehat{f}(\xi-\eta)\widehat{g}(\eta)d\eta\big]\Big\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|m\|_{\mathcal{S}^{\infty}}\|f\|_{L^q}\|g\|_{L^r} \quad \text{if } \frac{1}{p}=\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{r}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\Big\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} m'(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\widehat{f}(\xi-\eta)\widehat{h}(\sigma)\widehat{g}(\eta-\sigma)d\eta d\sigma\big]\Big\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|m'\|_{\mathcal{S}^{\infty}}\|f\|_{L^q}\|g\|_{L^r}\|h\|_{L^s}, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\frac{1}{p}=\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{r}+\frac{1}{s}$.

Proof. The proof is standard, or see [23] for detail. □

To estimate the $\mathcal{S}^{\infty}_{k,k_1,k_2}$ or the $\mathcal{S}^{\infty}_{k,k_1,k_2,k_3}$ norms of symbols, we constantly use the following lemma .

Lemma 3.2. *For* $i \in \{2, 3\}$, *if* $f : \mathbb{R}^{2i} \to \mathbb{C}$ *is a smooth function and* $k_1, \cdots, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, *then the following estimate holds,*

$$\|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2i}} f(\xi_1,\cdots,\xi_i)\prod_{j=1}^{i} e^{ix_j\cdot\xi_j}\psi_{k_j}(\xi_j)d\xi_1\cdots d\xi_i\|_{L^1_{x_1,\cdots,x_i}} \lesssim \sum_{m=0}^{i+1}\sum_{j=1}^{i} 2^{mk_j}\|\partial_{\xi_j}^m f\|_{L^\infty}. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. Let's first consider the case when $i = 2$. Through scaling, it is sufficient to prove above estimate for the case when $k_1 = k_2 = 0$. From Plancherel theorem, we have the following two estimates,

$$\|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2i}} f(\xi_1,\xi_2)e^{i(x_1\cdot\xi_1+x_2\cdot\xi_2)}\psi_0(\xi_1)\psi_0(\xi_2)d\xi_1 d\xi_2\|_{L^2_{x_1,x_2}} \lesssim \|f(\xi_1,\xi_2)\|_{L^\infty_{\xi_1,\xi_2}},$$

$$\|(|x_1|+|x_2|)^3\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2i}} f(\xi_1,\xi_2)e^{i(x_1\cdot\xi_1+x_2\cdot\xi_2)}\psi_0(\xi_1)\psi_0(\xi_2)d\xi_1 d\xi_2\|_{L^2_{x_1,x_2}} \lesssim \sum_{m=0}^{3}\big[\|\partial_{\xi_1}^m f\|_{L^\infty}+\|\partial_{\xi_2}^m f\|_{L^\infty}\big],$$

which are sufficient to finish the proof of (3.4). We can prove the case when $i = 3$ very similarly, hence we omit the details here. □

So far, we still don't know explicitly what quadratic terms and the remainder terms are in (1.1). We derive it from (1.4) it here. Let

$$B(h)\psi = \big[G(h)\psi + \nabla h\cdot\nabla\psi\big]/(1+|\nabla h|^2), \tag{3.5}$$

and recall the system of equations (1.4) satisfied by h and ψ, we can reformulate it as follows,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t h = \Lambda^2\psi + \Lambda_2[G(h)\psi] + \Lambda_{\geq 3}[G(h)\psi], \\ \partial_t\psi = -h - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\Lambda^2\psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\Lambda_{\geq 3}\Big[(1+|\nabla h|^2)(B(h)\psi)^2\Big]. \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

Define $u = h + i\Lambda\psi$ and $Q(h,\psi) = \Lambda_2[G(h)\psi]$. Very naturally, we have

$$h = \frac{u+\bar{u}}{2}, \quad \psi = \Lambda^{-1}\big(\frac{u-\bar{u}}{2i}\big). \tag{3.7}$$

With above notation, we can derive the equation satisfied by u from (3.6) as follows,

$$(\partial_t + i\Lambda)u = \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}} Q_{\mu,\nu}(u^{\mu}, u^{\nu}) + \mathcal{R}, \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$Q_{\mu,\nu}(u^{\mu}, u^{\nu}) = \frac{c_\nu}{2} Q(u^{\mu}, \Lambda^{-1}u^{\nu}) + \frac{ic_\mu c_\nu}{2}\Lambda\big[-\frac{\nabla}{\Lambda}u^{\mu}\cdot\frac{\nabla}{\Lambda}u^{\nu} + \Lambda u^{\mu}\Lambda u^{\nu}\big], \quad \mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \Lambda_{\geq 3}[\partial_t h] + i\Lambda\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\partial_t \psi] = \Lambda_{\geq 3}[G(h)\psi] + i\Lambda\Lambda_{\geq 3}[(1+|\nabla h|^2)(B(h)\psi)^2], \tag{3.10}$$

and $c_+ := -i/2$ and $c_- := i/2$.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that the symbol of quadratic term $Q_{\mu,\nu}(u_\mu, u_\nu)$ is given by $q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)$, for $k, k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and any $\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}$ we have the following estimates*

$$\|q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} \lesssim 2^{k/2+k_-/2+k_{1,+}}, \quad \text{if } |k_1-k_2|\leq 10, \tag{3.11}$$

$$\|q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} \lesssim 2^{\max\{k_1,k_2\}+\max\{k_1,k_2\}_+/2}, \quad \text{if } |k_1-k_2|\geq 10. \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. From (3.9) and Lemma 3.2, it's easy to see that above estimates hold for the symbols determined other than quadratic term $Q(\cdot,\cdot)$. From (2.9) in Lemma 2.2, we can see that above estimates also hold for the symbol of quadratic term $Q(\cdot,\cdot)$. $\square$

We have the following lemma on the L^∞-decay estimate for the linear solution,

Lemma 3.4. *For $f\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we have the following L^∞ type estimates:*

$$\|e^{it\Lambda}P_k f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (1+|t|)^{-1} 2^{3k/2}\|f\|_{L^1}, \quad \text{if } k\geq 0. \tag{3.13}$$

$$\|e^{it\Lambda}P_k f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (1+|t|)^{-\frac{1+\theta}{2}} 2^{\frac{(3-3\theta)k}{2}}\|f\|_{L^1}, \quad 0\leq\theta\leq 1, \quad \text{if } k\leq 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Proof. After checking the expansion of the phase, see (4.1), we can apply the main result in [18][Theorem 1:(a)&(b)] directly to derive above results. $\square$

We will use the following lemma for operators with angular cutoff function very often in the bad type phases scenarios. We state it and prove it here.

Lemma 3.5. *For $l, k, k_1, k_2\in\mathbb{Z}$, $l\leq 0$, $k_2\leq k_1$, and $f, g\in L^2\cap L^1$, we define a bilinear form as follows,*

$$T(f,g) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))m(\xi,\eta)f^{\mu}(\xi-\eta)g^{\nu}(\eta)d\eta,$$

where $\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}$, $m(\xi,\eta)\in S^\infty$, then following estimates hold,

$$\|T(f,g)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|m\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}} \min\big\{2^{2k_2+l}\|f\|_{L^2}\|g\|_{L^\infty_\xi}, 2^{k_2+l/2}\|f\|_{L^2}\|g\|_{L^2}, 2^{k_2+k_1+l}\|f\|_{L^\infty_\xi}\|g\|_{L^2}\big\}, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\|T(f,g)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|m\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}} \min\{2^{k+k_1+l}\|f\|_{L^\infty_\xi}\|g\|_{L^2}, 2^{k+l/2}\|f\|_{L^2}\|g\|_{L^2}, 2^{k_2+k+l}\|g\|_{L^\infty_\xi}\|f\|_{L^2}\}, \tag{3.16}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\|T(f,g)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|m\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} \min\{&\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[e^{-it\Lambda(\xi)}g(\xi)\psi_{k_2}(\xi)]\|_{L^\infty_x},\\ &2^{(k_1-k_2)/2}\|g(\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)\|_{L^2}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[e^{-it\Lambda(\xi)}f(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi)]\|_{L^\infty_x}\}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Proof. • We first estimate (3.15) and (3.16).To see the role of the angle $\angle(\xi, \nu\eta)$, we first do angular localizations for two inputs. For any given small number $0 < 2^n \lesssim 1$, we can decompose the unite circle $\mathbb{S}^1$ into the union of angular sections with bounded (with upper bound given by an absolute constant) overlaps, where each sector has angular size 2^n. These cutoff functions form a partition of unity. We label those sectors by their angles $\omega = \xi/|\xi|$, use $|\omega|$ to denotes the size of angle and use $b_n^{\omega}(\xi)$ to denote a fixed standard bump function that supported in this sector.

With above definitions and notation, we are ready to prove (3.15). From orthogonality in L^2, we have

$$\|T(f,g)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|\omega_1|,|\omega_2|\sim 2^{l+k_2-k_1}\\ |\omega_1\pm\omega_2|\sim 2^{l+k_2-k_1}\\ |\omega_3|\sim 2^l, |\omega_1-\nu\omega_3|\sim 2^l}} \Big\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)} \psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta) m(\xi,\eta)$$

$$\times\, b_{l+k_2-k_1}^{\omega_1}(\xi) b_{l+k_2-k_1}^{\omega_2}(\xi-\eta) f^{\mu}(\xi-\eta) g^{\nu}(\eta) b_l^{\omega_3}(\eta)\, d\eta \Big\|_{L^2_\xi}^2 \tag{3.18}$$

$$\lesssim \|m\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}}^2 \min\{\sum_{\omega_2} \sup_{\omega_1,\omega_3} 2^{4k_2+2l} \|f(\xi-\eta) b_{l+k_2-k_1}^{\omega_2}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\|_{L^2}^2 \|g(\eta)\|_{L^\infty_\eta}^2,$$

$$\sum_{\omega_3} \sup_{\omega_1,\omega_2} 2^{2k_2+l} \|f(\xi-\eta) b_{l+k_2-k_1}^{\omega_2}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\|_{L^2}^2 \|b_l^{\omega_3}(\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta) g(\eta)\|_{L^2_\eta}^2\}. \tag{3.19}$$

In the above summations, ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 are all same as listed in the first summation of (3.19).We will use the following two facts: (i) when sum with respect to ω_2, the multiplicity (i.e., how many times it has been counted) of the summation is a finite number; (ii) when sum with respect to ω_3, the multiplicity of the summation is $2^{k_1-k_2}$ because there are $2^{k_1-k_2}$ number of sectors ω_2 corresponds to the same sector ω_3. Hence

$$\sum_{\omega_3} \sup_{\omega_1,\omega_2} 2^{2k_2+l} \|f(\xi-\eta) b_{l+k_2-k_1}^{\omega_2}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\|_{L^2}^2 \|b_l^{\omega_3}(\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta) g(\eta)\|_{L^2_\eta}^2$$

$$\lesssim 2^{2k_2+l+k_1+k_2+l} \|f\|_{L^\infty_\xi}^2 \sum_{\omega_3} \sup_{\omega_1,\omega_2} \|b_l^{\omega_3}(\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta) g(\eta)\|_{L^2_\eta}^2 \lesssim 2^{2k_1+2k_2+2l} \|f\|_{L^\infty_\xi}^2 \|g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Therefore, it's easy to derive our desired estimate (3.15).

On the other hand, if we first use the size of support of ξ, then the following estimate holds

$$\text{L.H.S. of (3.19)} \lesssim \|m\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}}^2 \sum_{\substack{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_3\\ \text{same as above}}} 2^{2k+l} \|f(\xi-\eta) b_{l+k_2-k_1}^{\omega_2}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\|_{L^2}^2$$

$$\times \|b_l^{\omega_3}(\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta) g(\eta)\|_{L^2_\eta}^2 \lesssim \|m\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}}^2 \min\Big\{ \sum_{\omega_3} \sup_{\omega_1,\omega_2} 2^{2k+2l+k_1+k_2} \|f\|_{L^\infty_\xi}^2 \|b_l^{\omega_3}(\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta) g\|_{L^2_\eta}^2,$$

$$2^{2k+l}\|f\|_{L^2}^2 \|g\|_{L^2}^2, \sum_{\omega_2} \sup_{\omega_1,\omega_3} 2^{2k+2k_2+2l} \|f(\xi-\eta) b_{l+k_2-k_1}^{\omega_2}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\|_{L^2}^2 \|g\|_{L^\infty_\xi}^2 \Big\}$$

$$\lesssim \|m\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}}^2 \min\{2^{2k+2k_1+2l}\|f\|_{L^\infty_\xi}^2 \|g\|_{L^2}^2, 2^{2k+l}\|f\|_{L^2}^2\|g\|_{L^2}^2, 2^{2k_2+2k+2l}\|g\|_{L^\infty_\xi}^2 \|f\|_{L^2}^2\}.$$

Hence finish the proof of (3.16).

• Now we proceed to prove (3.17). From $L^2 - L^\infty$ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1, the following estimate holds,

$$(3.18) \lesssim \|m\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}}^2 \min\Big\{ \sum_{\omega_2} \sup_{\omega_1,\omega_3} \|f(\xi-\eta) b_{l+k_2-k_1}^{\omega_2}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\|_{L^2}^2$$

$$\times\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[e^{-it\Lambda(\eta)}g(\eta)b_l^{\omega_3}(\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)]\|^2_{L^\infty_x}, \sum_{\omega_3}\sup_{\omega_1,\omega_2}\|g(\eta)b_l^{\omega_3}(\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)\|^2_{L^2}$$

$$\times\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[e^{-it\Lambda(\xi-\eta)}f(\xi-\eta)b^{\omega_2}_{l+k_2-k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\|^2_{L^\infty_x}\}$$

$$\lesssim \|m\|^2_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}}\min\big\{\|f_{k_1}\|^2_{L^2}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[e^{-it\Lambda(\eta)}g_{k_2}(\eta)]\|^2_{L^\infty_x}, 2^{(k_1-k_2)}\|g_{k_2}\|^2_{L^2}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[e^{-it\Lambda(\eta)}f_{k_1}(\eta)]\|^2_{L^\infty_x}\big\}.$$

Hence finishing the proof of (3.17). Note that in above estimate, we used the facts that the multiplicity of summation with respect to ω_3 is $2^{k_1-k_2}$ and the kernel of symbol $b_l^{\omega}(\xi)\psi_k(\xi)$ belongs L^1, where $l, k \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

Lemma 3.6. *For* $m, k, k_1, k_2, \kappa, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $t \in [2^{m-1}, 2^m]$, $2^{-\kappa} \leq 2^{m-2\delta m}$, *and* $f, g \in L^2$, *we define bilinear forms as follow,*

$$T_1(f,g) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\frac{\psi_0(2^{-\kappa}\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta))}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\psi_k(\xi)m(\xi,\eta)\widehat{f}^{\mu}_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\widehat{g}^{\nu}_{k_2}(\eta)d\eta,$$

$$T_2(f,g) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\frac{\psi_0(2^{-\kappa}\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta))}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\psi_k(\xi)m(\xi,\eta)\widehat{f}^{\mu}_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\widehat{g}^{\nu}_{k_2}(\eta)\varphi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))d\eta,$$

then the following estimates hold,

$$\|T_1(f,g)\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\kappa}\|m\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}}\sup_{|\lambda|\leq 2^{\delta m}}\min\{\|e^{-i(t+\lambda 2^{-\kappa})\Lambda}f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty}\|g_{k_2}\|_{L^2},$$

$$\|e^{-i(t+\lambda 2^{-\kappa})\Lambda}g_{k_2}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\} + 2^{-10m-\kappa+k}\|m\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}}\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|g_{k_2}\|_{L^2}, \tag{3.20}$$

$$\|T_2(f,g)\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\kappa}\|m\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}}\sup_{|\lambda|\leq 2^{\delta m}}\min\{2^{(k_1-k_2)/2}\|e^{-i(t+\lambda 2^{-\kappa})\Lambda}f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty}\|g_{k_2}\|_{L^2},$$

$$\|e^{-i(t+\lambda 2^{-\kappa})\Lambda}g_{k_2}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\} + 2^{-10m-\kappa+k}\|m\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}}\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|g_{k_2}\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.21}$$

Proof. To prove (3.20), we use inverse Fourier transform to rewrite $T_1(f,g)$ as follows,

$$T_1(f,g) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} 2^{-\kappa}e^{i(t+\lambda 2^{-\kappa})\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{\chi}(\lambda)\psi_k(\xi)m(\xi,\eta)\widehat{f}^{\mu}_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\widehat{g}^{\nu}_{k_2}(\eta)d\eta d\lambda,$$

where

$$\widehat{\chi}(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\lambda x}\frac{\psi_0(x)}{x}dx, \Longrightarrow |\widehat{\chi}(\lambda)| \lesssim (1+|\lambda|)^{-N_0^3}. \tag{3.22}$$

Hence, when $|\lambda| \leq 2^{\delta m}$, we use $L^2 - L^\infty$ bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1, which gives the first part of estimate (3.20). When $|\lambda| \geq 2^{\delta m}$, from (3.22), $\widehat{\chi}(\lambda)$ provides fast decay. After using the size of support of ξ first and then use $L^2 - L^2$ type estimate, we derive the second part of estimate (3.20). The estimate (3.21) can be proved very similarly after combining above argument with the proof of (3.17). We omit details here. □

4. ANALYSIS OF PHASES

In this section, we will mainly study the properties of phases associated with different types of quadratic terms. Recall that $\Lambda(|\xi|)=\sqrt{\tanh|\xi||\xi|}$. From direct computations, we have

$$\Lambda'(r)=\frac{4re^{2r}+e^{4r}-1}{2(1+e^{2r})^{3/2}(e^{2r}-1)^{1/2}r^{1/2}}\geq 0,\quad r\geq 0,$$

$$\Lambda''(r)=\frac{2e^{4r}(1+8r^2)-1-e^{8r}-8e^{6r}r(2r-1)-8e^{2r}r(1+2r)}{4(1+e^{2r})^{5/2}(e^{2r}-1)^{3/2}r^{3/2}},\quad r\geq 0.$$

An important observation is that $\Lambda''(r)\leq 0$ and $\Lambda''(r)=0$ if and only if $r=0$. To show this fact, we only have to prove that the numerator is nonpositive. We define $f(r)$ to be the numerator of $\Lambda''(r)$ and then have the following decomposition,

$$f(r):=g(r)+h(r),\quad g(r):=16e^{4r}r^2-8e^{6r}r^2-8e^{2r}r^2=-8e^{2r}r^2(e^{2r}-1)^2,$$
$$h(r):=2e^{4r}-1-e^{8r}-8e^{6r}r(r-1)-8e^{2r}r(1+r).$$

Obviously, $g(r)\leq 0$ and $g(r)=0$ if and only $r=0$. It remains to check $h(r)$. After taking up to four derivatives for $h(r)$, we have $h^{(n)}(0)=0$ for $n\in\{0,1,2,3\}$, and the following estimate holds,

$$h^{(4)}(r)=-128e^{2r}(5+5r+r^2+27e^{4r}(r+3r^2)+32e^{6r}-27e^{4r}-4e^{2r})<0,$$

hence $h(r)\leq 0$ and $h(r)=0$ if and only $r=0$.

The asymptotic behavior of $\Lambda(r)$ at 0 and ∞ can be described as follows,

$$\lim_{r\to 0}\Lambda'(r)=1,\quad \lim_{r\to\infty}\Lambda'(r)r^{1/2}=\frac{1}{2},\quad \Lambda(r)=r-\frac{1}{6}r^3+o(r^4),\text{if } r\ll 1. \tag{4.1}$$

Now, we proceed to consider the phases associated with the quadratic terms. Recall that they are given as follows,

$$\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta):=\Lambda(|\xi|)-\mu\Lambda(|\xi-\eta|)-\nu\Lambda(|\eta|),\quad \mu,\nu\in\{+,-\},\xi,\eta\in\mathbb{R}^2.$$

As an example (other types can be analyzed similarly), we analyze the phase given as follows,

$$\Lambda(|\xi|)-\Lambda(|\xi+\eta|)+\Lambda(|\eta|)=\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{II},\quad \mathrm{I}:=\Lambda(|\xi|+|\eta|)-\Lambda(|\xi+\eta|),$$
$$\mathrm{II}:=\Lambda(|\xi|)+\Lambda(|\eta|)-\Lambda(|\xi|+|\eta|).$$

As mentioned in the Introduction section, an very important fact in above decomposition is that both I and II are positive, which can be derived from the fact that $\Lambda'(r)\geq 0$ and $\Lambda''(r)\leq 0$.

Note that I is zero if and only if ξ and η are parallel and in the same direction. Now, we proceed to estimate the size of II. Define

$$f(r,s)=\Lambda(r)+\Lambda(s)-\Lambda(r+s),0\leq s\leq r,$$

then, we have

$$f(r,s)=\int_0^r[\Lambda'(\tau_1)-\Lambda'(s+\tau_1)]d\tau_1=\int_0^r\int_0^s-\Lambda''(\tau_1+\tau_2)d\tau_2 d\tau_1\geq 0. \tag{4.2}$$

Note that, if $r\leq 1$, then $-\Lambda''(r)\sim r$, and if $r\geq 1$, then $-\Lambda''(r)\sim r^{-3/2}$. From (4.2), we can see that the following estimate holds if $r,s\leq 1$,

$$r^2s\lesssim f(r,s)\lesssim r^2s.$$

If $s \leq 1 \leq r$, then we have

$$s \lesssim \int_{1/2}^{1} \int_{0}^{s} -\Lambda''(\tau_1 + \tau_2) d\tau_1 d\tau_2 \leq f(r,s) \leq \Lambda(s) \leq s.$$

At last, if $1 \leq s \leq r$, then we have

$$s^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \int_{s/2}^{s} \int_{s/2}^{s} -\Lambda''(\tau_1 + \tau_2) d\tau_2 d\tau_1 \leq f(r,s) \leq \Lambda(s) \leq |s|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

To sum up, we have

$$f(r,s) \sim s^{\frac{1}{2}} \min\{s,1\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \min\{r,1\}^2, \quad 0 \leq s \leq r. \tag{4.3}$$

With warming up from above discussions, we are ready to proceed into more comprehensive analysis.

Lemma 4.1. *For $k_1, k_2, k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $l \leq 2$, $k_2 \leq k_1$, $\mu, \nu \in \{+,-\}$, assume that $|\xi| \sim 2^k, |\xi - \eta| \sim 2^{k_1}, |\eta| \sim 2^{k_2}$. We have the following estimates on the size of phase. If $k_2 \leq k_1 - 5$, we have*

$$|\Lambda(|\xi|) - \Lambda(|\xi - \eta|) - \nu\Lambda(|\eta|)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi, \nu\eta)) \sim 2^{k_2} \max\{2^{-k_{1,+}/2+2l}, 2^{-k_{2,+}/2+2k_{1,-}}\}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$|\Lambda(|\xi|) - \mu\Lambda(|\xi - \eta|) - \nu\Lambda(|\eta|)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi, \nu\eta)) \gtrsim 2^{k_2} \max\{2^{-k_{1,+}/2+2l}, 2^{-k_{2,+}/2+2k_{1,-}}\}. \tag{4.5}$$

If $k_1 - 5 \leq k_2 \leq k_1$, we have

$$|\Lambda(|\xi|) - \Lambda(|\xi - \eta|) + \Lambda(|\eta|)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi, -\eta)) \sim 2^k \max\{2^{-k_+/2+2k_{1,-}}, 2^{-k_{1,+}/2+2l}\}, \tag{4.6}$$

$$|\Lambda(|\xi|) + \Lambda(|\xi - \eta|) - \Lambda(|\eta|)| \sim 2^{(k+k_-)/2}, \tag{4.7}$$

$$|\Lambda(|\xi|) - \mu\Lambda(|\xi - \eta|) - \nu\Lambda(|\eta|)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi, \nu\eta)) \gtrsim 2^k \max\{2^{-k_+/2+2k_{1,-}}, 2^{-k_{1,+}/2+2l}\}. \tag{4.8}$$

We also have several estimates on the gradient of phase. If $k_2 \leq k_1 - 5$, we have

$$2^{-k_{1,+}/2+\max\{l,2k_{1,-}\}} \lesssim \big|\Lambda'(|\xi - \eta|)\frac{\xi - \eta}{|\xi - \eta|} - \nu\Lambda'(|\eta|)\frac{\eta}{|\eta|}\big|\psi_l(\angle(\xi, \nu\eta)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{l,2k_{1,-}\}}. \tag{4.9}$$

If $k_1 - 5 \leq k_2 \leq k_1$, $k \leq k_1 - 5$, we have

$$\big|\Lambda'(|\xi - \eta|)\frac{\xi - \eta}{|\xi - \eta|} + \Lambda'(|\eta|)\frac{\eta}{|\eta|}\big|\psi_l(\angle(\xi, \nu\eta)) \sim 2^{k-k_1+\max\{l,2k_{1,-}\}-k_{1,+}/2}, \tag{4.10}$$

$$\big|\Lambda'(|\xi - \eta|)\frac{\xi - \eta}{|\xi - \eta|} - \Lambda'(|\eta|)\frac{\eta}{|\eta|}\big|\psi_l(\angle(\xi, \nu\eta)) \sim 2^{-k_{1,+}/2}. \tag{4.11}$$

Proof. As in the assumption, $|\xi| \sim 2^k, |\xi - \eta| \sim 2^{k_1}$, and $|\eta| \sim 2^{k_2}$, we omit the frequency localization functions in the following for convenience, but readers should keep the sizes of frequencies in mind.

- We first prove (4.4) and (4.5). Recall that $k_2 \leq k_1 - 5$, if $\nu = -$, then the following estimate holds from (4.3),

$$|\Lambda(|\xi|) - \Lambda(|\xi - \eta|) + \Lambda(\eta)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi, -\eta)) = \big[\Lambda(|\xi|) - \Lambda(|\xi| + |\eta|) + \Lambda(|\eta|)$$

$$+\Lambda(|\xi|+|\eta|) - \Lambda(|\xi-\eta|)\big]\psi_l(\angle(\xi, -\eta)) \sim 2^{(k_2+k_{2,-})/2+2k_{1,-}} + 2^{-k_{1,+}/2}[|\xi|+|\eta|-|\xi-\eta|]\psi_l(\angle(\xi, -\eta))$$

$$\sim 2^{(k_2+k_{2,-})/2+2k_{1,-}} + 2^{-k_{1,+}/2+k_2+2l} \sim 2^{k_2} \max\{2^{-k_{1,+}/2+2l}, 2^{-k_{2,+}/2+2k_{1,-}}\}.$$

If $\nu = +$, then the following estimate holds from (4.3),

$$|\Lambda(|\xi|) - \Lambda(|\xi - \eta|) - \Lambda(|\eta|)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi, \eta)) \sim \big[\Lambda(|\xi - \eta|) - \Lambda(|\xi - \eta| + |\eta|) + \Lambda(|\eta|)$$

$$+ \Lambda(|\xi - \eta| + |\eta|) - \Lambda(|\xi|)\big]\psi_l(\angle(\xi, \eta)) \sim 2^{(k_2+k_{2,-})/2+2k_{1,-}} + 2^{-k_{1,+}/2}[|\xi - \eta| + |\eta| - |\xi|]\psi_l(\angle(\xi, \eta)) \tag{4.12}$$

$$\sim 2^{(k_2+k_{2,-})/2+2k_{1,-}} + 2^{-k_{1,+}/2+k_2+2l} \sim 2^{k_2}\max\{2^{-k_{1,+}/2+2l}, 2^{-k_{2,+}/2+2k_{1,-}}\}.$$

When $\mu=-$, the size of phase is bigger than the case when $\mu=+$, hence (4.5) holds.

- We move on to prove (4.6), (4.7), and (4.8). Note that $k_1-5\le k_2\le k_1$. If $\nu=-$, then the following estimate holds from (4.3)

$$|\Lambda(|\xi|)-\Lambda(|\xi-\eta|)+\Lambda(|\eta|)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi,-\eta)) \sim \big[\Lambda(|\xi|)-\Lambda(|\eta|+|\xi|)+\Lambda(|\eta|)$$

$$+\Lambda(|\eta|+|\xi|)-\Lambda(|\xi-\eta|)\big]\psi_l(\angle(\xi,-\eta)) \sim 2^{(k+k_-)/2+2k_{1,-}} + 2^{-k_{1,+}/2}[|\xi|+|\eta|-|\xi-\eta|]\psi_l(\angle(\xi,-\eta))$$

$$\sim 2^{(k+k_-)/2+2k_{1,-}} + 2^{-k_{1,+}/2+k+2l} \sim 2^{k}\max\{2^{-k_+/2+2k_{1,-}}, 2^{-k_{1,+}/2+2l}\}.$$

As $k_2\le k_1$, the following estimate holds,

$$2^{(k+k_-)/2} \le \Lambda(|\xi|) \le \Lambda(|\xi|)+\Lambda(|\xi-\eta|)-\Lambda(|\eta|) \le \Lambda(|\xi|)+2^{-k_{1,+}/2}\big||\xi-\eta|-|\eta|\big| \lesssim 2^{(k+k_-)/2}.$$

In other words, desired estimate (4.7) holds. Since the case when $(\mu,\nu)=(+,-)$ is the smallest, it is easy to see (4.8) holds.

- We proceed to prove (4.9). Note that

$$\big|\Lambda'(|\xi-\eta|)\frac{\xi-\eta}{|\xi-\eta|}-\nu\Lambda'(|\eta|)\frac{\eta}{|\eta|}\big|\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \sim \max\{|\Lambda'(|\xi-\eta|)-\Lambda'(|\eta|)|, 2^{-k_{1,+}/2}\angle(\xi-\eta,\nu\eta)\}, \tag{4.13}$$

and the following estimates hold when $k_2\le k_1-5$,

$$\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)\sim\angle(\xi-\eta,\nu\eta),$$

$$2^{-k_{1,+}/2+2k_{1,-}} \le \int_{|\xi-\eta|/2}^{|\xi-\eta|}|\Lambda''(r)|dr \le |\Lambda'(|\xi-\eta|)-\Lambda'(|\eta|)| \lesssim \int_0^{|\xi-\eta|}|\Lambda''(r)|dr \le 2^{2k_{1,-}}.$$

Hence, it's easy to see (4.9) holds.

- We proceed to prove (4.10). The estimate (4.13) also holds. Recall that $0<|\xi|\ll|\xi-\eta|\approx|\eta|$. Hence, if $|\xi-\eta|=|\eta|$ then the angle between ξ and η can't be zero; meanwhile, if $\xi-\eta$ and η are parallel, then $|\xi-\eta|\neq|\eta|$. Note that

$$\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)=2^l, k\le k_1-5, \Longrightarrow \angle(\xi-\eta,-\eta)\sim 2^{k-k_1+l}\sim 2^{k-k_{1,-}+l-k_{1,+}}, \tag{4.14}$$

$$\big|\Lambda'(|\xi-\eta|)-\Lambda'(|\eta|)\big| \sim 2^{-3k_{1,+}/2+k_{1,-}}\big||\xi-\eta|-|\eta|\big|. \tag{4.15}$$

From (4.14), we know that (4.10) holds if $l\ge 2k_{1,-}-10$. It remains to consider the case when $l\le 2k_{1,-}-10$. As the angle between ξ and $\nu\eta$ is very small in this case, we have $\big||\xi-\eta|-|\eta|\big|\sim 2^k$, which further implies our desired estimate (4.10) by combining (4.13) and (4.15).

- At last, we prove (4.11). After observing that $(\eta-\xi)/|\eta-\xi|$ and $\eta/|\eta|$ are almost in the same direction (their angle is less than $\pi/2$) as $k\le k_1-10$, it's very straightforward to see our desired estimate (4.11) holds. □

Lemma 4.2. *For $k_1,k_2,k,l\in\mathbb{Z}$, $l\le 2$, $k_2\le k_1$, $\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}$, we localize frequencies as follows $|\xi|\sim 2^k, |\xi-\eta|\sim 2^{k_1}, |\eta|\sim 2^{k_2}$. Either if $k_2\le k_1-5$, $\mu=-$ or if $k\le k_1-5\le k_2$, $\mu\nu=+$, we have*

$$\Big(\Big|\frac{\nabla_\xi\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\Big|+\Big|\frac{\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\Big|\Big) \lesssim 2^{-k_1+k_{1,+}/2}, \tag{4.16}$$

$$\Big[2^{k_1-k_2}\Big|\frac{\partial_\xi\partial_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{|\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|^2}\Big|+\Big|\frac{\partial_\eta\partial_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{|\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|^2}\Big|\Big]\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \lesssim 2^{-k_2-2\max\{l,2k_{1,-}\}+k_{1,+}}. \tag{4.17}$$

Either if $k_2 \leq k_1 - 5$, $\mu = +$, *or if* $k \leq k_1 - 5 \leq k_2$, $\mu\nu = -$, *we have,*

$$\Big(2^{k}\Big|\frac{\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\Big| + 2^{k_2}\Big|\frac{\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\Big|\Big) \lesssim 2^{-k_{1,-}+k_{1,+}/2}, \tag{4.18}$$

$$\Big[2^{k-k_2}\Big|\frac{\partial_\xi\partial_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{|\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|^2}\Big| + \Big|\frac{\partial_\eta\partial_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{|\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|^2}\Big|\Big]\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \lesssim 2^{-\min\{k,k_2\}-2\max\{l,2k_{1,-}\}+k_{1,+}}. \tag{4.19}$$

Proof. • We first prove prove (4.16). Under the assumption that $k_2 \leq k_1 - 5$, $\mu = -$ or $k \leq k_1 - 5 \leq k_2$, $\mu\nu = +$, we have

$$|\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)| \gtrsim 2^{k_1 - k_{1,+}/2}, \quad |\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)| + |\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)| \lesssim 2^{-k_{2,+}/2} \Longrightarrow \text{(4.16) holds}.$$

• We proceed to prove (4.17). Note that the worst scenario is when ∇_ξ or ∇_η hits the numerator of $(\xi-\eta)/|\xi-\eta|$ or $\eta/|\eta|$ of $\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)$, as a result, the following estimate holds,

$$|\partial_\xi\partial_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)| \lesssim 2^{-k_1-k_{1,+}/2}, \quad |\partial_\eta\partial_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)| \lesssim 2^{-k_2-k_{2,+}/2}. \tag{4.20}$$

For the case we are considering, either estimate (4.9) or estimate (4.11) holds for $\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}$. Combining (4.20), (4.9) and (4.11), we can see our desired estimate (4.17) holds.

• We proceed to prove (4.18). If $k_2 \leq k_1 - 5$ and $\mu = +$, then from (4.5), (4.9), and (4.10), we have

$$|\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \gtrsim 2^{k_2+2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}-k_{1,+}/2}, \quad |\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{l,2k_{1,-}\}},$$

$$|\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \lesssim 2^{k_2-k_1+\max\{l,2k_{1,-}\}-k_{1,+}/2},$$

hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(2^{k}\Big|\frac{\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\Big| + 2^{k_2}\Big|\frac{\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\Big|\Big) &\lesssim \sup_{l\leq 2}\Big(2^{k_1}\Big|\frac{\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\Big| + 2^{k_2}\Big|\frac{\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\Big|\Big)\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \\ &\lesssim \sup_{l\leq 2} 2^{\max\{l,2k_{1,-}\}-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+k_{1,+}/2} \lesssim 2^{-k_{1,-}+k_{1,+}/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

Therefore (4.18) holds for this case. If $k \leq k_1 - 5 \leq k_2$ and $\mu\nu = -$, then from (4.8), (4.9), and (4.10), we have

$$|\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \gtrsim 2^{k+2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}-k_{1,+}/2}, \quad |\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{l,2k_{1,-}\}},$$

$$|\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\psi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \lesssim 2^{k-k_1+\max\{l,2k_{1,-}\}-k_{1,+}/2}.$$

Same as we did in the estimate (4.21), it's easy to see (4.18) also holds for this case.

• We proceed to prove (4.19). The proof and the estimate are exactly same as (4.17) except when $k \leq k_1 - 5 \leq k_2$ and $\mu\nu = -$. For this case, we have

$$\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta) = -\mu(\Lambda'(|\eta-\xi|)\frac{\eta-\xi}{|\eta-\xi|} - \Lambda'(|\eta|)\frac{\eta}{|\eta|}), \tag{4.22}$$

hence

$$|\partial_\xi\partial_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)| \lesssim 2^{-k_1-k_{1,+}/2}, \tag{4.23}$$

$$|\partial_\eta\partial_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)| \lesssim \sup_{|\sigma|\sim 2^{k_2},|\beta|=3} |\partial_\sigma^\beta(\Lambda(|\sigma|))|\big||\eta| - |\eta-\xi|\big| \lesssim 2^{k-2k_1-k_{1,+}/2}. \tag{4.24}$$

Combining (4.23) and (4.24) with estimate (4.10) in Lemma 4.1, we can see the desired estimate (4.19) holds. Therefore, finishing the proof of this lemma. □

We proceed to study the phase associated with the cubic terms, which generally has the following form,

$$\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) := \Lambda(\xi) - \mu\Lambda(\xi-\eta) - \nu\Lambda(\eta-\sigma) - \tau\Lambda(\sigma), \quad \mu,\nu,\tau \in \{+,-\}. \tag{4.25}$$

The structure inside the phase $\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ is very delicate when all frequencies are comparable, as both $\nabla_\sigma\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ and $\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ could be "0" (see also subsection 7.3). However, when two inputs are not comparable, the structures inside the phase can be summarized as the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that* $|\xi| \sim 2^k$, $|\xi-\eta| \sim 2^{k_1}$, $|\eta| \sim 2^{k_2}$, $|\eta-\sigma| \sim 2^{k_1'}$, *and* $|\sigma| \sim 2^{k_2'}$, $k, k_1, k_2, k_1', k_2' \in \mathbb{Z}$, $k_2' \le k_1'$. *Either if* $k \le k_2 - 5 \le k_1 - 4$ *or if* $k_2 \le k_1 - 5 \le k - 4$, *then the following estimate holds,*

$$|\nabla_\sigma\Phi^{\mu,\nu,-\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)| \gtrsim 2^{-3k_{1,+}'/2+k_{1,-}'+k_{2,-}}, \tag{4.26}$$

$$|\nabla_\sigma\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)|\psi_{\ge\tilde{l}}(\eta-2\sigma) \gtrsim 2^{-3k_{1,+}'/2+k_{1,-}'+\tilde{l}}, \tag{4.27}$$

$$|\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)|\psi_{\le\tilde{l}}(\eta-2\sigma) \gtrsim 2^{-3\max\{k_{1,+},k_{1,+}'\}/2+\max\{k_{1,-}',k_{1,-}\}+k_1}, \tag{4.28}$$

for any $\tilde{l} \le k_{2,-} - 10$.

Proof. From (4.25), we have

$$\nabla_\sigma\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) = \nu\Lambda'(|\eta-\sigma|)\frac{\eta-\sigma}{|\eta-\sigma|} - \tau\Lambda'(|\sigma|)\frac{\sigma}{|\sigma|}, \tag{4.29}$$

$$\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) = \mu\Lambda'(\xi-\eta)\frac{\xi-\eta}{|\xi-\eta|} - \nu\Lambda'(\eta-\sigma)\frac{\eta-\sigma}{|\eta-\sigma|}. \tag{4.30}$$

Therefore

$$|\nabla_\sigma\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)| \gtrsim \max\{2^{-3k_{1,+}'/2}2^{k_{1,-}'}\big||\eta-\sigma|-|\sigma|\big|, 2^{-k_{1,+}'/2}\angle(\eta-\sigma,\nu\tau\sigma)\}, \tag{4.31}$$

$$|\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)| \gtrsim 2^{-3\max\{k_{1,+},k_{1,+}'\}/2}\max\{2^{\max\{k_{1,-}',k_{1,-}\}}\big||\xi-\eta|-|\eta-\sigma|\big|, \angle(\xi-\eta,\mu\nu(\eta-\sigma))\}. \tag{4.32}$$

Note that when $\nu\tau = -$ and $\angle(\eta-\sigma,\nu\tau\sigma) \le 2^{-5}$, we have $|\eta-\sigma|-|\sigma| \sim |\eta|$. From (4.31), now it is easy to see our desired estimate (4.26) holds.

When $\nu\tau = +$, we know that $|\eta-\sigma|-|\sigma|$ and $\angle(\eta-\sigma,\sigma)$ cannot be small at the same time when σ is away from $\eta/2$. More precisely, the following estimate holds,

$$2^{k_{1,-}'}\big||\eta-\sigma|-|\sigma|\big| + \angle(\eta-\sigma,\sigma) \gtrsim 2^{\tilde{l}+k_{1,-}'-k_{1,+}'}, \quad \text{if } |\eta-2\sigma| \ge 2^{\tilde{l}}.$$

Combining above estimate with (4.31), it is easy to see our desired estimate (4.27) holds. When σ is very close to $\eta/2$, we have $\eta-\sigma \approx \eta/2$. As either $|\eta| \ll |\xi-\eta|$ or $|\eta| \approx |\xi-\eta|$, we know that $|\xi-\eta|-|\eta-\sigma| \sim |\xi-\eta|/2$. As a result, from (4.32), our desired estimate (4.28) holds. □

5. THE SET-UP OF THE IMPROVED Z-NORM ESTIMATE

In this section, we introduce the set-up of doing the improved Z-norm estimate for the solutions of (3.8), which further enables us to derive the improved L^∞ estimate from Lemma 3.4. The argument is reduced naturally to control the following three parts: good type quadratic terms, bad type quadratic terms and remainder terms, which will be specified in this section. We will deal with each of them separately in section 6, 7 and 8.

5.1. **The set-up.** For any fixed $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define associated sets as follows,

$$\chi_k^1 := \{(k_1,k_2) : k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, k \le \max\{k_1,k_2\} - 5 \le \min\{k_1,k_2\}\},$$
$$\chi_k^2 := \{(k_1,k_2) : k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, \min\{k_1,k_2\} \le k-5, |\max\{k_1,k_2\} - k| \le 4\},$$
$$\chi_k^3 := \{(k_1,k_2) : k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, k-5 < \min\{k_1,k_2\} \le \max\{k_1,k_2\} < k+5\}.$$

The set χ_k^1 corresponds to the High × High interaction with the very low frequency output; the set χ_k^2 corresponds to the Low × High and the High × Low type interaction with a very low frequency input; the set χ_k^3 corresponds to the type of interaction where the frequencies of two inputs and the output are all comparable. From the symmetry between two inputs, we assume that $k_2 = \min\{k_1, k_2\}$ in the rest of this paper, otherwise we can do change of variables to switch the roles of k_1 and k_2.

Recall the equation satisfied by u in (3.8), we define the associated profile of u as $f(t) := e^{it\Lambda}u(t)$ and then rewrite the equation (3.8) in terms of profile $f(t)$ as follows,

$$\partial_t f = \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}} T^{\mu,\nu}(f^\mu, f^\nu) + \mathcal{R}', \tag{5.1}$$

where $\mathcal{R}' = e^{it\Lambda}\mathcal{R}$ and the bilinear operator $T^{\mu,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is defined as follows,

$$T^{\mu,\nu}(g,h) := \mathcal{F}^{-1}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{g}(\xi-\eta)\widehat{h}(\eta)q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)d\eta\Big].$$

In later argument, we will find that the decomposition of time interval contributes a "$\log t$" growth for the endpoint of the case $\xi = 2\eta$. This growth caused by technicality can be avoid by doing the following normal form transformation at the very beginning as follows,

$$v(t) := u(t) + \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z},(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^3} A_{\mu,\nu}(u^\mu_{k_1}(t), u^\nu_{k_2}(t)), \tag{5.2}$$

where the symbol $m_{\mu,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$ of $A_{\mu,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is defined as follows,

$$m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta) := -\frac{q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)}{i\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}. \tag{5.3}$$

Define $g(t) := e^{it\Lambda}v(t)$. From (5.1) and (5.2), we have

$$\widehat{g}(t,\xi) = \widehat{f}(t,\xi) + \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z},(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)} m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\widehat{f^\mu_{k_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^\nu_{k_2}}(t,\eta)d\eta. \tag{5.4}$$

From estimate (5.6) in Lemma 5.1, we can see that the Z-norm of $f(t)$ and $g(t)$ are comparable, Hence, it would be sufficient to prove the following estimate to close the argument,

$$\sup_{t_1,t_2\in[2^{m-1},2^{m+1}]} \|g(t_2) - g(t_1)\|_Z \lesssim 2^{-\delta m}\epsilon_0, \quad [2^{m-1},2^{m+1}] \subset [0,T]. \tag{5.5}$$

In the rest of this paper, time "t" will be naturally restricted inside the time interval $[2^{m-1}, 2^{m+1}]$, where "m" is a fixed and sufficiently large number.

Lemma 5.1. *Under the bootstrap assumption* (2.12)*, the following estimate holds,*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \Big\| \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z},(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^3} e^{it\Lambda} A_{\mu,\nu}(u^\mu_{k_1}(t), u^\nu_{k_2}(t))\Big\|_Z \lesssim \epsilon_0. \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. The proof of this Lemma requires the techniques established in section 7. Hence we postpone the proof to subsubsection 7.3.3. □

From the definition of Z-norm, the bootstrap assumption (2.12), and the linear decay estimates in Lemma 3.4, we have the following estimates,

$$\|P_k f(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \begin{cases} 2^{-N_0 k_+} 2^{\delta m}\epsilon_0 & \text{if } k \geq 0 \\ \sum_{j\geq -k} \|Q_{k,j} f\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{(1-\alpha)k}\epsilon_1 & \text{if } k \leq 0, \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

$$\|\widehat{f_k}(\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} \lesssim 2^{-\alpha k - 6k_+}\epsilon_1, \quad \|e^{-it\Lambda} P_k f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-\alpha k - m - 4.5k_+}\epsilon_1. \tag{5.8}$$

Note that the L^∞- estimate in (5.8) is not sharp when k is sufficiently small. There is another way to estimate it by choosing $\theta = 1 - 2\alpha/3$ in (3.14) in Lemma 3.4. As a result, the following estimate holds,

$$\|e^{it\Lambda} P_k f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-m+\alpha m/3} 2^{\alpha k} \|f_k\|_{L^1} \lesssim 2^{-m+\alpha m/3}\epsilon_1, \quad \text{if } k \leq 0.$$

To sum up, we have the following linear decay estimate at low frequency part,

$$\|e^{-it\Lambda} P_k f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \min\{2^{-m-\alpha k}, 2^{-(1-\alpha/3)m}\}\epsilon_1, \quad \text{if } k \leq 0. \tag{5.9}$$

5.2. **Splitting the quadratic terms.** In this subsection, we split the quadratic terms into two types, good type and bad type, based on the properties of their associated phases. For good type phase, the size of phase is not highly degenerated. For bad type phase, the size of phase is highly degenerate but the two types of angle inside $\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)$ and $\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)$ agree. One of them proportionally decreases to zero as the other one decreases to zero. With this key observation, we can utilize the fact that the angle is very small when a bad phase is highly degenerated.

From the normal form transformation that we did in (5.2), we know that quadratic terms with $(k_1,k_2) \in \chi_k^3$ are canceled out. We only have to consider the case when $(k_1,k_2) \in \chi_k^1 \cup \chi_k^2$.

5.2.1. *Good type phases.* Recall that phase $\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)$ is defined as follows,

$$\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta) = \big(\Lambda(|\xi|) - \mu\Lambda(|\xi-\eta|) - \nu\Lambda(|\eta|)\big).$$

It is easy to verify the following estimate holds when $k_2 \leq k_1$,

$$|\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta) \sim 2^{k_1/2+k_{1,-}/2}, \ (\mu,\nu) \in \{(-,-),(+,+)\}, (k_1,k_2) \in \chi_k^1, \tag{5.10}$$

$$|\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta) \sim 2^{k_1/2+k_{1,-}/2}, \ (\mu,\nu) \in \{(-,-),(-,+)\}, (k_1,k_2) \in \chi_k^2. \tag{5.11}$$

From (5.10) and (5.11), we can see that the sizes of phases in various scenarios are not highly degenerated. We refer above mentioned scenarios as good type phases in later context.

5.2.2. *Bad type phases.* For the other possible cases that were not mentioned in previous subsubsection, we call them bad type phases. For simplicity, we drop frequencies localization functions in the following context but one should remember that $|\xi| \sim 2^k$, $|\xi-\eta| \sim 2^{k_1}$ and $|\eta| \sim 2^{k_2}$ with $(k_1,k_2) \in \chi_k^1 \cup \chi_k^2$ and $k_2 \leq k_1$. Note that

$$\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta) = \Lambda'(|\xi|)\frac{\xi}{|\xi|} - \mu\Lambda'(|\xi-\eta|)\frac{\xi-\eta}{|\xi-\eta|},$$

$$\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta) = \mu\Lambda'(|\xi-\eta|)\frac{\xi-\eta}{|\xi-\eta|} - \nu\Lambda'(|\eta|)\frac{\eta}{|\eta|}.$$

It turns out that the relative size between $\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)$ and $\nabla_\eta \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)$ plays an essential role to close the argument. Hence it is necessary to consider the relation between $\angle(\xi, \mu(\xi-\eta))$ and $\angle(\mu(\xi-\eta), \nu\eta)$

with the angle $\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)$ dyadically localized and fixed. We will see that, in the bad type phases scenario, these two angles agree and their sizes are proportional.

For $(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^1$ and $(\mu,\nu)\in\{(+,-),(-,+)\}$, we have $\nu=-\mu$ and

$$\angle(\xi,\mu(\xi-\eta))\sim\angle(\xi,\nu\eta),\quad \frac{\angle(\xi-\eta,-\eta)}{\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)}=\frac{|\xi|}{|\xi-\eta|},\Longrightarrow\angle(\xi-\eta,-\eta)=2^{k-k_1}\angle(\xi,\nu\eta).$$

For $(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^2$, and $(\mu,\nu)\in\{(+,-),(+,+)\}$, we have $\mu=+$ and

$$\angle(\xi-\eta,\nu\eta)\sim\angle(\xi,\nu\eta),\quad \angle(\xi,\xi-\eta)\sim\frac{|\eta|}{|\xi-\eta|}\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)=2^{k_2-k_1}\angle(\xi,\nu\eta).$$

To sum up, from above discussion, (5.1) and (5.4), we can rewrite the equation satisfied by the frequency localized profile $g(t)$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t g_k=&\sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}}\sum_{i=1,2,3}\sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^i}T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1},f_{k_2})+P_k[\mathcal{R}']+\sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}}\sum_{k_1,k_2\in\chi_k^3}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\\&\times\big[-q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\widehat{f_{k_1}^{\mu}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f_{k_2}^{\nu}}(t,\eta)+m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\partial_t\big(\widehat{f_{k_1}^{\mu}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f_{k_2}^{\nu}}(t,\eta)\big)\big]d\eta\Big]\\&=\text{good}_k(t)+\text{bad}_k(t)+P_k[\mathcal{R}'],\end{aligned}\tag{5.12}$$

where

$$\text{good}_k(t)=\sum_{(k_1,k_2,\mu,\nu)\in\mathcal{P}_{\text{good}}^k}T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}^{\mu},f_{k_2}^{\nu}),\tag{5.13}$$

$$\text{bad}_k(t)=\sum_{(k_1,k_2,\mu,\nu)\in\mathcal{P}_{\text{bad}}^k}T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}^{\mu},f_{k_2}^{\nu})+\sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^3}\sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big[K^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}^{\mu},f_{k_2}^{\nu})\big],\tag{5.14}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\text{good}}^k$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\text{bad}}^k$ denote the set of possible combination of (k_1,k_2) and (μ,ν) as follows,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{good}}^k=\chi_k^1\times\{(-,-),(+,+)\}\cup\chi_k^2\times\{(-,-),(-,+)\},$$
$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{bad}}^k=\chi_k^1\times\{(+,-),(-,+)\}\cup\chi_k^2\times\{(+,-),(+,+)\},$$

and bilinear terms $K^{\mu,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is defined as follows,

$$K^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}^{\mu},f_{k_2}^{\nu})=\int e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\partial_t\big(\widehat{f_{k_1}^{\mu}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f_{k_2}^{\nu}}(t,\eta)\big)d\eta.\tag{5.15}$$

From (5.12), the following identity holds,

$$P_kg(t_2)-P_kg(t_1)=\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\text{good}_k(t)+\text{bad}_k(t)+P_k[\mathcal{R}'(t)]dt.$$

Hence to prove (5.5), it will be sufficient if we can derive the following two propositions,

Proposition 5.2. *Under the bootstrap assumption* (2.12) *and the energy estimate* (2.13), *we have the following estimates for the remainder term* $\mathcal{R}'$*:*

$$\sup_{t_1,t_2\in[2^{m-1,m+1}]}\ \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z},j\geq\max\{-k,0\}}2^{\delta j}\|\int_{t_1}^{t_2}P_k[\mathcal{R}'(t)]dt\|_{B_{k,j}}\lesssim 2^{-\delta m}\epsilon_0.\tag{5.16}$$

$$\sup_{t\in[2^{m-1,m+1}]}\|\mathcal{R}'(t)\|_Z+2^{-(1-\theta)k+\theta m}\|P_k\big(\mathcal{R}'(t)\big)\|_{L^2}+\|\widehat{\mathcal{R}'}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi}\lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0,\quad\theta\in[0,1].\tag{5.17}$$

Proof. Postponed to section 8. □

Proposition 5.3. *Under the bootstrap assumption* (2.12) *and the energy estimate* (2.13)*, we have following Z-norm estimates for any $t_1, t_2 \in [2^{m-1}, 2^{m+1}]$,*

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}, j\geq \max\{-k,0\}} 2^{\delta j} \| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathrm{good}_k(t) dt \|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{-\delta m}\epsilon_0, \tag{5.18}$$

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}, j\geq \max\{-k,0\}} 2^{\delta j} \| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathrm{bad}_k(t) dt \|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{-\delta m}\epsilon_0. \tag{5.19}$$

Proof. In section 6 and 7, we will mainly prove (5.18) and (5.19) respectively under the assumption that Proposition 5.2 holds. □

Lemma 5.4. *Under the bootstrap assumption* (2.12)*, the energy estimate* (2.13) *and Proposition 5.2, the following estimates hold,*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-k} t^{-\delta} \| f_k(t,x)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon_0, \tag{5.20}$$

$$\sup_{t\in[2^{m-1},2^{m+1}]} \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-k} \| \partial_t f_k(t,x)\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0, \tag{5.21}$$

$$\sup_{t\in[2^{m-1},2^{m+1}]} \sup_{k\leq 0} \| \widehat{f}_k(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} \lesssim 2^{3\delta m}\epsilon_0. \tag{5.22}$$

Proof. Recall (5.1). From $L^2 - L^\infty$ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1, (3.11) and (3.12) in Lemma 3.3, and (5.17) in Proposition 5.2, the following estimate holds,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[2^{m-1},2^{m+1}]} \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-k} \| \partial_t f_k(t,x)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sup_{t\in[2^{m-1},2^{m+1}]} 2^{-k} \| P_k[\mathcal{R}'](t)\|_{L^2} \\ + \sum_{k_2\leq k_1} 2^{-k+k+k_{1,+}} \| f_{k_2}(t)\|_{L^2} \| e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1}(t)\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0 + \sum_{k_2\leq k_1} 2^{-m+(1-2\alpha)k_2 - 3k_{1,+}} \epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0.\end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

Recall that the initial data belongs to L^1, hence initially it is of size ϵ_0. More precisely,

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-k} \| f_k(0,x)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \| f(0,x)\|_{L^1} \lesssim \epsilon_0. \tag{5.24}$$

Combining (5.24) and (5.23), it is easy to see our desired estimate (5.20) holds. From (5.1) and the third estimate in (5.17), the following estimate holds straightforwardly for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}, k \leq 0$,

$$\| \widehat{f}_k(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} \lesssim 2^{\delta m}\epsilon_0 + \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}, k_1,k_2\in\mathbb{Z}} \| \int_0^t e^{is\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)} q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta) \widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1}}(s,\xi-\eta) \widehat{f^{\nu}_{k_2}}(s,\eta) \psi_k(\xi) d\eta ds \|_{L^\infty_\xi}.$$

For the quadratic terms, we do integration by parts in time when $-2m \leq k_1, k_2 \leq 2\beta m$. Note that there are only "m^2" cases. From estimates in Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\Big\| \frac{q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)} \Big\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}} \lesssim 2^{k-\min\{k,k_2\} - 2k_{1,-} + 3k_{1,+}/2}.$$

Therefore, from above estimate, $L^2 - L^2$ type estimate, (5.23) and (5.20), we have

$$\sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}, k_1,k_2\in\mathbb{Z}} \| \int_0^t e^{is\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)} q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta) \widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1}}(s,\xi-\eta) \widehat{f^{\nu}_{k_2}}(s,\eta) d\eta ds \|_{L^\infty_\xi} \lesssim \sum_{k_2\leq -2m, \text{or } k_1\geq 2\beta m} 2^m$$

$$
\times 2^{k+k_{1,+}} \sup_{t\leq 2^m} \|f_{k_1}(t)\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2}(t)\|_{L^2} + \sum_{-2m\leq k_2\leq k_1\leq 2\beta m} 2^{k-\min\{k,k_2\}-2k_{1,-}+3k_{1,+}/2} \sup_{t\leq 2^m}\|f_{k_1}(t)\|_{L^2}
$$

$$
\times\|f_{k_2}(t)\|_{L^2} + \sum_{-2m\leq k_2\leq k_1\leq 2\beta m} 2^{k-\min\{k,k_2\}-2k_{1,-}+3k_{1,+}/2}\int_0^t \big(\|\partial_t f_{k_1}(s)\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2}(s)\|_{L^2}
$$

$$
+ \|f_{k_1}(s)\|_{L^2}\|\partial_t f_{k_2}(s)\|_{L^2}\big) ds \lesssim m^2 2^{2\delta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{3\delta m}\epsilon_0. \tag{5.25}
$$

Now it is easy to see our desired estimate (5.22) holds. We can see that it is better than the first estimate in (5.8) when k is sufficiently small. □

6. THE IMPROVED Z-NORM ESTIMATE: GOOD TYPE PHASES

In this section, we estimate all bilinear terms listed in (5.13). We let j to be fixed and consider all possible scenarios. We expect the argument used in this relatively easier case can help readers to get familiar with how this argument works.

6.1. **When** $(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^1, (\mu,\nu)\in\{(-,-),(+,+)\}$**.** Recall that $k_2\leq k_1$. We first use L^2-L^∞ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and (3.11) in Lemma 3.3 to rule out the very high frequency of inputs as follows,

$$
\sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^1, k_2\geq((1+\delta)j+\delta m)/(N_0-8)} \|\int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1},f_{k_2})dt\|_{B_{k,j}}
$$

$$
\lesssim \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^1, k_2\geq((1+\delta)j+\delta m)/(N_0-8)} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j}\|q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}}\|e^{-it\Lambda}P_{k_1}f\|_{L^\infty}\|P_{k_2}f\|_{L^2}
$$

$$
\lesssim \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^1, k_2\geq((1+\delta)j+\delta m)/(N_0-8)} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+2k_2-N_0k_1-m-4k_1}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.
$$

Then we rule out the very low output frequency. We first use the size of support of ξ and then use L^2-L^2 type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 to derive the following estimate,

$$
\sup_{-j\leq k\leq -(1+\delta)(m+j)/(2+\alpha)} \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^1} \|\int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1},f_{k_2})dt\|_{B_{k,j}}
$$

$$
\lesssim \sup_{-j\leq k\leq -(1+\delta)(m+j)/(2+\alpha)} \sum_{|k_1-k_2|\leq 10} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+k}\|q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}}\|P_{k_1}f\|_{L^2}\|P_{k_2}f\|_{L^2}
$$

$$
\lesssim \sup_{-j\leq k\leq -(1+\delta)(m+j)/(2+\alpha)} 2^{(2+\alpha)k+m+j}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.
$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to consider fixed k and k_1 in the following range:

$$
-(1+\delta)(m+j)/(2+\alpha)\leq k+5\leq k_1\leq((1+\delta)j+\delta m)/(N_0-8), \tag{6.1}
$$

since we have at most $(m+j)^2$ cases in total, which is only a logarithmic loss.

6.1.1. *If* $j \geq (1+20\delta)m$. We first do spatial localizations for two inputs and then have the following decomposition,

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}(t), f_{k_2}(t))dt = \sum_{j_1\geq -k_{1,-}, j_2\geq -k_{2,-}} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1,j_1}(t), f_{k_2,j_2}(t))dt.$$

In the rest of this paper, we use the convention that (k_1, j_1) and (k_2, j_2) are naturally restricted in $\mathcal{J}$ even without explicitly written. If $\min\{j_1, j_2\} \geq j - \delta j - \delta m$, then we have

$$\sum_{\min\{j_1,j_2\}\geq j-\delta j-\delta m} \| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1,j_1}(t), f_{k_2,j_2}(t))dt\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{\min\{j_1,j_2\}\geq j-\delta j-\delta m} 2^{\alpha k+m+j}$$
$$\times 2^{k+(1-2\alpha)k_2-j_1-j_2-3k_{1,+}}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z \|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_Z \lesssim 2^{m+2\delta m-(1-2\delta)j}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta j-2\delta m}\epsilon_0.$$

It remains to consider the case $\min\{j_1, j_2\} \leq j - \delta j - \delta m$. Since $|k_1 - k_2| \leq 5$, we can assume that $j_1 = \min\{j_1, j_2\}$, otherwise, we can simply do change of variables to switch the roles of $\xi - \eta$ and η. For this case, we can do integration by parts in "ξ" to see rapidly decay. More precisely, after integration by parts in time once, we have

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1,j_1}(t), f_{k_2,j_2}(t))dt$$
$$= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{ix\cdot\xi + it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)} \nabla_\xi \cdot \big(\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}_{k_2,j_2}}(t,\eta) a_{\mu,\nu}(t,x,\xi,\eta)\big) d\eta d\xi dt,$$

where

$$a_{\mu,\nu}(t,x,\xi,\eta) = q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\frac{x+t\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{|x+t\nabla_\xi\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|^2}. \tag{6.2}$$

Note that

$$|\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)| \lesssim 1 \Longrightarrow \frac{x+t\nabla_\xi\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{|x+t\nabla_\xi\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|^2}\varphi_j^k(x) \sim 2^{-j}. \tag{6.3}$$

Hence, we can gain 2^{-j} if we do integration by parts in "ξ" once. We also need to find out what the maximal loss is. If ∇_ξ hits input $\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(\cdot)$, then we lose 2^{j_1}. If ∇_ξ hits the cutoff functions or the symbol $a_{\mu,\nu}(t,x,\xi,\eta)$, the total loss is at most $\max\{2^{-k_1}, 2^{-k}, 1\}$ and this can be derived from (4.20), (4.24), and (3.11). Since $j_1 \geq \max\{-k_1, 0\}$, we at most lose $\max\{2^{j_1}, 2^{-k}\}$. Therefore, the net gain of doing integration by parts in "ξ" once is $\max\{2^{-j+j_1}, 2^{-j+k}\} \lesssim 2^{-\delta j-\delta m}$. Note that we used the fact that $j + k \geq \delta j + \delta m$, which can be derived from (6.1). We can do this process as many times as we want to see rapidly decay. As a result, we have the following estimate after using $L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}$-norm of symbol and $L^2 - L^2$ type estimate,

$$\Big|\int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1,j_1}(t), f_{k_2,j_2}(t))dt\Big|\varphi_j^k(x) \lesssim 2^{-10j}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2} \tag{6.4}$$

which further gives us

$$\sum_{\min\{j_1,j_2\}\leq j-\delta j-\delta m} \| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1,j_1}(t), f_{k_2,j_2}(t))dt\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{m+2j-10j}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-2\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

Therefore finishing the proof for this case.

6.1.2. *If* $j \leq (1+20\delta)m$. For this case, we have

$$k+5 \leq k_1 \leq ((1+\delta)j+\delta m)/(N_0-8) \leq \beta m, \quad \beta := 1/980.$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{F}[\int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}(t), f_{k_2}(t))dt](\xi) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}_{k_2}}(t,\eta)q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)d\eta dt,$$

we do integration by parts in time once for above integral and have the following identity,

$$\mathcal{F}[\int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}(t), f_{k_2}(t))dt](\xi) = \sum_{i=1,2}\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2} + J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2}, \tag{6.5}$$

where

$$\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2} = (-1)^{i-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it_i\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{f^{\mu}}(t_i,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}}(t_i,\eta)m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)d\eta, \tag{6.6}$$

$$J^{\mu,\nu,1}_{k_1,k_2} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{f^{\mu}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{\partial_t f^{\nu}}(t,\eta)m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)d\eta dt, \tag{6.7}$$

$$J^{\mu,\nu,2}_{k_1,k_2} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{\partial_t f^{\mu}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}}(t,\eta)m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)d\eta dt, \tag{6.8}$$

and the symbol $m_{\mu,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is same as in (5.3).

From Lemma 3.2, (3.11) and (3.12) in Lemma 3.3, (5.10), and (4.16) in Lemma 4.2, we know that the following estimate holds uniformly,

$$\|m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^{\infty}_{k,k_1,k_2}} \lesssim 2^{k/2+k_-/2+3k_{1,+}-k_1} \lesssim 2^{3\beta m}. \tag{6.9}$$

From $L^2 - L^\infty$ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1, (5.21) in Lemma 5.4 and (6.9), we have the following estimate if $k_1 \leq -4\beta m$ or $k \leq -40\beta m$,

$$\sum_{i=1,2}\|\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2}\|_{B_{k,j}} + \|J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +j+3\beta m}\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_2}\|_{L^\infty} + 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +j+m+3\beta m}\times$$
$$\Big(\|\partial_t f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_2}\|_{L^\infty} + \|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty}\|\partial_t f_{k_2}\|_{L^2}\Big) \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+(1-2\alpha)k_1+3\beta m}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

It remains to consider the case when $k_1 \geq -4\beta m$ and $k \geq -40\beta m$.

- *Estimate of endpoint case.* For this case, we first do spatial localizations for two inputs and have the following decomposition,

$$\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2} = \sum_{j_1\geq -k_{1,-}, j_2\geq -k_{2,-}}\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2}, \tag{6.10}$$

$$\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2} = (-1)^{i-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it_i\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(t_i,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}_{k_2,j_2}}(t_i,\eta)m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)d\eta.$$

We first consider the case when $\max\{j_1,j_2\} \geq m+k+k_1-4\beta m$. From the $L^2 - L^\infty$ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and (6.9), we can put the input with larger spatial concentration in L^2 and the other one in L^∞. As a result, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+k+k_1-4\beta m}\|\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+k+k_1-4\beta m} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +j+3\beta m}$$

$$\times 2^{-\max\{j_1,j_2\}-m-\alpha(k_1+k_2)}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_Z \lesssim 2^{-m-(1+\alpha)(k+k_1)+8\beta m}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-2\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

Then we consider the case when $\max\{j_1,j_2\}\le m+k+k_1-4\beta m$. Note that, we only have at most m^3 cases to consider. Hence, it's sufficient to consider fixed j_1 and j_2. For this case, we do integration by parts in "η" many times to see rapidly decay. More precisely, after integration by parts in η, we have the following identity,

$$\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2} = \frac{(-1)^{i-1}}{t_i}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it_i\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\nabla_\eta\cdot\big(\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(t_i,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}_{k_2,j_2}}(t_i,\eta)\tilde{m}_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\big)d\eta, \tag{6.11}$$

$$\tilde{m}_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta) = -\frac{m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}{i|\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|^2}. \tag{6.12}$$

If ∇_η hits $\widehat{f}_{k_1,j_1}$ and $\widehat{f}_{k_2,j_2}$, we at most lose $2^{\max\{j_1,j_2\}-k-k_1+5k_{1,+}/2}$. If ∇_η hits the symbol $\tilde{m}_{\mu,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$, then from estimates (4.17) and (4.16) in Lemma 4.2, we at most lose $2^{-5k_{1,-}+k_{1,+}}$. Therefore, through integration by parts in "η" once, we can gain at least $2^{-\beta m}$ as the total gain is 2^{-m} but the total loss is at most $\max\{2^{\max\{j_1,j_2\}-k-k_1+5k_{1,+}/2}, 2^{-5k_{1,-}+k_{1,+}}\}\le 2^{m-\beta m}$. We can do this process many times to see rapidly decay, more precisely, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\le m+k+k_1-4\beta m}\|\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\le m+k+k_1-4\beta m} 2^{-10m}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2}$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-2\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

- *Estimate of* $J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2}$, $i\in\{1,2\}$. After plugging in the equation satisfied by $\partial_t f$ and doing dyadic decompositions for the quadratic terms of $\partial_t f$, we have

$$J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2} = \sum_{k_1',k_2'\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{\mu',\kappa'\in\{+,-\}} J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{k_1',k_2'} + \mathrm{JR}^i_{k_1,k_2},\quad J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{k_1',k_2'} := \sum_{j_1'\ge -k_{1,-}',\, j_2'\ge -k_{2,-}',\, j_i\ge -k_{i,-}} H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{j_i;j_1',j_2'},$$

$$H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{j_1',j_2'} = \sum_{j_i\ge -k_{i,-}} H^i_{j_i;j_1',j_2'},\quad H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{j_i;j_1'} = \sum_{j_2'\ge -k_{2,-}'} H^i_{j_i;j_1',j_2'},\quad i\in\{1,2\}, \tag{6.13}$$

where

$$H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{j_i;j_1',j_2'} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)} m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\kappa}_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma)d\eta d\sigma dt,$$

$$H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{j_i;j_1',j_2'} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi_2^{\tau,\kappa,\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)} m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\xi-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\kappa}_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}_{k_2,j_2}}(t,\eta)d\eta d\sigma dt,$$

$$\mathrm{JR}^1_{k_1,k_2} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{f^{\mu}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{\mathcal{R}'^{\nu}}(t,\eta)m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)d\eta dt,$$

$$\mathrm{JR}^2_{k_1,k_2} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{\mathcal{R}'^{\mu}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}}(t,\eta)m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)d\eta dt,$$

$$\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) = \Lambda(\xi)-\mu\Lambda(\xi-\eta)-\tau\Lambda(\eta-\sigma)-\kappa\Lambda(\sigma), \tag{6.14}$$

$$\Phi_2^{\tau,\kappa,\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) = \Lambda(\xi)-\tau\Lambda(\xi-\sigma)-\kappa\Lambda(\sigma-\eta)-\nu\Lambda(\eta), \tag{6.15}$$

$$m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) = m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\big(q_{\tau\nu,\kappa\nu}(\eta-\sigma,\sigma)\big)^{\nu}\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta), \tag{6.16}$$

$$m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) = m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\big(q_{\tau\mu,\kappa\mu}(\xi-\sigma,\sigma-\eta)\big)^{\mu}\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta). \tag{6.17}$$

Here, we remind readers that "$\tau\nu$ " is understood as the product of signs, e.g., $+- = -$. Also, as before, $f^+ := f$ and $f^- := \bar{f}$.

From (3.1) in Lemma 3.1, (6.9), and estimate (3.11) in Lemma 3.3, we have the following estimate,

$$\|m_{\mu,\nu,1}^{\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\psi_{k_1'}(\eta-\sigma)\psi_{k_2'}(\sigma)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty}+\|m_{\mu,\nu,2}^{\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\psi_{k_1'}(\xi-\sigma)\psi_{k_2'}(\sigma-\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty}\lesssim 2^{k_1+4\beta m}. \tag{6.18}$$

From (5.17) in Proposition 5.2, we know that the Z-norm of $\mathcal{R}'(t)$ decays at rate 2^{-m}, which compensates the loss from integration with respect to time. The method used in the estimate of $\mathrm{End}_{k_1,k_2}^{\mu,\nu,i}$ can be applied directly to the estimate of JR_{k_1,k_2}^1 and JR_{k_1,k_2}^2. We omit details here.

Now let us proceed to estimate $J_{k_1',j_1',k_2',j_2'}^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}$ and $J_{k_1',j_1',k_2',j_2'}^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $k_2'\leq k_1'$. From $L^\infty-L^\infty-L^2$ type trilinear estimate (3.3) in Lemma 3.1 and (6.18), the following estimate holds for fixed k_1' and k_2'

$$\sum_{i=1,2}\|J_{k_1',k_2'}^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}\|_{B_{k,j}}\lesssim 2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j+k_1+4\beta m}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim \min\{2^{\alpha k+(1-\alpha)k_1+(1-2\alpha)k_2'-2k_{1,+}'+4\beta m+20\delta m}, 2^{m+\alpha k+(1-\alpha)k_1+(1-2\alpha)k_2'-(N_0-6)k_{1,+}'+4\beta m+20\delta m}\}\epsilon_0. \tag{6.19}$$

For the second bound, we used the fact that $\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\lesssim 2^{k_1'}\|f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}\lesssim 2^{k_1'-N_0k_{1,+}'}\epsilon_1$.

From (6.19), we can rule out the case when $k_1'\geq\beta m$ or $k_2'\leq -6\beta m$. Hence, it is sufficient to consider fixed k_1', and k_2' such that $-6\beta m\leq k_2'\leq k_1'\leq\beta m$. Recall that $|\xi-\eta|\approx|\eta|$. Hence, with minor changes, we can estimate $J_{k_1',k_2'}^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}$ and $J_{k_1',k_2'}^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}$ in the same way. In the following, we only show the estimate of $J_{k_1',k_2'}^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}$ in details.

For $J_{k_1',k_2'}^{\mu,\nu,\tau,-\tau,1}$, we can do integration by parts in σ many times to rule out the case when $\max\{j_1',j_2'\}\leq m+k_2+k_1'-10\beta m$. More precisely, after doing integration by parts in "σ", we have

$$H_{j_1',j_2'}^{\mu,\nu,\tau,-\tau,1}=\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\frac{1}{t}e^{it\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,-\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}\nabla_\sigma\cdot\big(\tilde{m}_{\mu,\nu,1}^{\tau,-\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$$

$$\times\widehat{f_{k_1}^{\mu}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f_{k_1',j_1'}^{\tau}}(t,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f_{k_2',j_2'}^{-\tau}}(t,\sigma)\big)d\eta d\sigma dt, \tag{6.20}$$

where

$$\tilde{m}_{\mu,\nu,1}^{\tau,-\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma):=-\frac{m_{\mu,\nu,1}^{\tau,-\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\nabla_\sigma\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,-\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}{i|\nabla_\sigma\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,-\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)|^2}. \tag{6.21}$$

From (4.26) in Lemma 4.3 and (6.18), we have

$$|\nabla_\sigma\tilde{m}_{\mu,\nu,1}^{\tau,-\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)|\lesssim 2^{-2(k_{2,-}+k_{1,-}')-k_2'+9\beta m}\lesssim 2^{m/2}. \tag{6.22}$$

With above estimate, we can see that the net gain of doing integration by parts in "σ" once is at least $\max\{2^{-m/2}, 2^{-m+\max\{j_1',j_2'\}-k_{2,-}'-k_{1,-}'+9\beta m}\}$, which is less than $2^{-\beta m}$. Therefore, we can do this process many times to see rapidly decay.

From (6.18) and the $L^2-L^\infty-L^\infty$ type trilinear estimate (3.3) in Lemma 3.1, the following estimate holds after putting the input with the higher spatial concentration in L^2 and other inputs in L^∞,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_2+k_1'-4\beta m}\|H_{j_1',j_2'}^{\mu,\nu,\tau,-\tau,1}\|_{B_{k,j}}\lesssim\sum_{\max\{j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_2+k_1'-4\beta m}2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j}$$

$$\times 2^{k_1+4\beta m}2^{-\alpha k_1-\alpha k_1'-\alpha k_2'}2^{-2m-\max\{j_1',j_2'\}}\|f_{k_1',j_1'}\|_Z\|f_{k_2',j_2'}\|_Z\|f_{k_1}\|_Z\lesssim 2^{-m/2}\epsilon_0. \tag{6.23}$$

Now, we proceed to estimate $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\tau,1}_{k_1',k_2'}$. By doing integration by parts in η (when σ is close to $\eta/2$) and σ (when σ is away from $\eta/2$), we can first rule out the case when $\max\{j_1, j_1', j_2'\} \leq m+k_2+k_2'-10\beta m$. More precisely, we first split $H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\tau,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'}$ into two parts as follows,

$$H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\tau,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)} m^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\eta-\sigma)$$

$$\times\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma)\psi_{\leq k_2-10}(\eta-2\sigma)d\eta d\sigma dt + \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)} m^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$$

$$\times \widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1'}}(t,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_2'}}(t,\sigma)\psi_{>k_2-10}(\eta-2\sigma)\big)d\eta d\sigma dt. \tag{6.24}$$

For the first integral in (6.24), we do integration by parts in η. For the second integral in (6.24), we do integration by parts in σ. As a result, we have

$$H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\tau,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{t} e^{it\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}\nabla_\sigma\cdot\big(\tilde{m}^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma)\big)$$

$$+\frac{1}{t}e^{it\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}\nabla_\eta\cdot\big(\tilde{m}^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma)\big)d\eta d\sigma dt, \tag{6.25}$$

where

$$\tilde{m}^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) := -\frac{m^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\nabla_\sigma\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\psi_{>k_2-10}(\eta-2\sigma)}{i|\nabla_\sigma\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)|^2}, \tag{6.26}$$

$$\tilde{m}^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) := -\frac{m_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\nabla_\eta\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\psi_{\leq k_2-10}(\eta-2\sigma)}{i|\nabla_\eta\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)|^2}. \tag{6.27}$$

From (4.27) and (4.28) in Lemma 4.3 and (6.18), we have

$$|\nabla_\sigma\tilde{m}^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)| + |\nabla_\eta\tilde{m}^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)| \lesssim 2^{-2(k_{2,-}+k'_{1,-})-k_2'+9\beta m} \lesssim 2^{m/2}. \tag{6.28}$$

With above estimate, we can see that the net gain of doing integration by parts in "σ" and "η" once is at least $\max\{2^{-m/2}, 2^{-m+\max\{j_1,j_1',j_2'\}-k'_{2,-}-k'_{1,-}+2\beta m}\}$, which is less than $2^{-\beta m}$. Therefore, we can do this process many times to see rapidly decay.

It remains to consider the case when $\max\{j_1, j_1', j_2'\} \geq m+k_2+k_2'-10\beta m$. From (6.18) and the $L^2-L^\infty-L^\infty$ type trilinear estimate (3.3) in Lemma 3.1, the following estimate holds after putting the input with the higher spatial concentration in L^2 and other inputs in L^∞,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1,j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_2+k_2'-10\beta m}\|H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\tau,1}_{j_i;j_1',j_2'}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_2+k_2'-10\beta m} 2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j}2^{k_1+4\beta m}$$

$$\times 2^{-\alpha k_1'-\alpha k_2'-\alpha k_2}2^{-2m-\max\{j_1,j_1',j_2'\}}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z\|f_{k_1',j_1'}\|_Z\|f_{k_2',j_2'}\|_Z \lesssim 2^{-m/2}\epsilon_0. \tag{6.29}$$

6.2. **When** $(k_1, k_2) \in \chi_k^2, (\mu, \nu) \in \{(-,-), (-,+)\}$.

Recall that we previously assumed $k_2 = \min\{k_1, k_2\}$ for this case, we have $|k_1 - k| \leq 5$ and $k_2 \leq k_1 - 5$. As what we did before, we can first rule out the very low frequency case and the very high frequency case.

From estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and estimate (3.12) in Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}, f_{k_2}) dt \|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{\alpha k + 6k_+ + m + j} \| q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi - \eta, \eta) \|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} \| P_{k_1} f \|_{L^2} \| e^{-it\Lambda} P_{k_2} f \|_{L^\infty} \tag{6.30}$$

$$\lesssim 2^{\alpha k_1 + m + j + k_1 + (1-\alpha)k_1 + (2-\alpha)k_2 - (N_0 - 7)k_{1,+} - 4k_{2,+}} \epsilon_1^2. \tag{6.31}$$

From (6.31), it's easy to see the following estimates hold,

$$\sup_{k \leq -(1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(4-\alpha)} \sum_{k_2 \leq k-10} \| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}, f_{k_2}) dt \|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{-10\delta m - \delta j} \epsilon_0,$$

$$\sup_{k \geq (1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(N_0 - 10)} \sum_{k_2 \leq k-10} \| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}, f_{k_2}) dt \|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{-10\delta m - \delta j} \epsilon_0.$$

For a fixed k in the range $[-(1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(4-\alpha), (1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(N_0 - 10)]$, we have

$$\sum_{k_2 \leq -(1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(2-\alpha)} \| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}, f_{k_2}) dt \|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{k_2 \leq -(1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(2-\alpha)} \text{R.H.S. of (6.30)}$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{k_2 \leq -(1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(2-\alpha)} 2^{\alpha k + 6k_+ + m + j + 2k_{1,+} + (2-\alpha)k_2 - (N_0 - 6)k_{1,+}} \epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-10\delta m - \delta j}.$$

Now, it is sufficient to consider fixed k and k_2 in the following range,

$$-(1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(2-\alpha) \leq k_2 \leq k - 10, \tag{6.32}$$

$$-(1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(4-\alpha) \leq k \leq (1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(N_0 - 10). \tag{6.33}$$

6.2.1. *If* $j \geq m + 20\delta m$.

Note that the rough estimate (6.3) still holds in this case. The relative sizes of frequencies of inputs do not play a role there. With minor modifications, we can use the method we used in subsubsection 6.1.1 to show that the desired estimate also holds for this case. We omit details for this case here.

6.2.2. *If* $j \leq m + 20\delta m$.

Under the this assumption, we have at most m^3 possible cases in the range listed in (6.32) and (6.33) to consider. We use same notations used in subsection 6.1 but the only difference is that now $(k_1, k_2) \in \chi_k^2$ instead of inside χ_k^1. Same as we did before, we do integration by parts in time first and have the same identity as (6.5).

From $L^2 - L^\infty$ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and (6.9), the following estimate holds when $k_2 \leq -\alpha m$,

$$\sum_{i=1,2} \| \mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2} \|_{B_{k,j}} + \| J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2} \|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{\alpha k + 6k_+ + j + 3\beta m} \| e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1} \|_{L^\infty} \| f_{k_2} \|_{L^2} + 2^{\alpha k + 6k_+ + j + m + 3\beta m} \times$$

$$\Big(\| e^{-it\Lambda} \partial_t f_{k_1} \|_{L^\infty} \| f_{k_2} \|_{L^2} + \| e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1} \|_{L^\infty} \| \partial_t f_{k_2} \|_{L^2} \Big) \lesssim 2^{(1-\alpha)k_2 + \alpha m/2 + 10\beta m} \epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m - \delta j} \epsilon_0.$$

We used the following estimate in above estimate, which can be derived from $L^\infty - L^\infty$ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and (5.17) in Proposition 5.2,

$$\|e^{-it\Lambda}\partial_t f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\},k_2'\leq k_1'} \|e^{-it\Lambda}T^{\mu,\nu}(f^{\mu}_{k_1'}, f^{\nu}_{k_2'})\|_{L^\infty} + 2^{-m}\|P_{k_1}(\mathcal{R}')\|_Z$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{k_2'\leq k_1'} 2^{k_1'+k_{1,+}'}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_2'}\|_{L^\infty} + 2^{-2m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2m+\alpha m/2}\epsilon_0.$$

In above estimate, we scarified a little bit decay rate to guarantee the summability with respect to k_2'.

Now it is sufficient to consider the case when $k_2 \geq -\alpha m$.

- *Estimate of the endpoint case.* Same as before, we can use $L^2 - L^\infty$ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and (6.9) to rule out the case when $\max\{j_1, j_2\} \geq m + 2k_2 - 4\beta m$ as follows,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+2k_2-4\beta m} \|\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+2k_2-4\beta m} 2^{\alpha k+6k_++j+3\beta m}$$

$$\times 2^{-\max\{j_1,j_2\}-m-\alpha(k_1+k_2)}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_Z \lesssim 2^{-m-(2+2\alpha)k_2+15\beta m}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

For the case when $\max\{j_1, j_2\} \leq m + 2k_2 - 4\beta m$, we will do integration by parts in“ η” to see rapidly decay. If ∇_η hits $\widehat{f}_{k_1,j_1}$ and $\widehat{f}_{k_2,j_2}$, we at most lose $2^{\max\{j_1,j_2\}-2k_2+5k_{1,+}/2}$, which is less than $2^{m-\beta m}$. If ∇_η hits the symbol $\tilde{m}_{\mu,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$, then from estimates (4.17) and (4.16) in Lemma 4.2, we at most lose $2^{-k_2-4k_{1,-}+k_{1,+}}$, which is less than $2^{m-\beta m}$. Hence the net gain is at least $2^{-\beta m}$ from integration by parts in “η” once. We can keep doing this process to see rapidly decay.

- *Estimate of $J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$.* Same as before, the method used in the estimate of $\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{k_1,k_2}$ can be applied directly to the estimate of $\mathrm{JR}^1_{k_1,k_2}$ and $\mathrm{JR}^2_{k_1,k_2}$. Now we proceed to estimate $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{k_1',k_2'}$ and $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{k_1',k_2'}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $k_2' = \min\{k_1', k_2'\}$.

Recall (6.16) and (6.17). From (3.1) in Lemma 3.1, (3.12) in Lemma 3.3, and (6.9), we have the following estimate,

$$\|m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\psi_{k_1'}(\eta-\sigma)\psi_{k_2'}(\sigma)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty} + \|m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\psi_{k_1'}(\xi-\sigma)\psi_{k_2'}(\sigma-\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty} \lesssim 2^{k_1'+4\beta m}. \tag{6.34}$$

From (6.34) and $L^2 - L^\infty - L^\infty$ type trilinear estimate (3.3) in Lemma 3.1, the following estimate holds for fixed k_1' and k_2',

$$\sum_{i=1,2} \|J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{k_1',k_2'}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{i=1,2} 2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j+k_1'+4\beta m}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_i}\|_{L^\infty}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim \min\{2^{(1-\alpha)(k_1'+k_2')+11\beta m}, 2^{(1-\alpha)k_2'+m+4\beta m-(N_0-8)k_{1,+}'}\}\epsilon_0.$$

From above estimate, we can rule out the case when $k_2' \leq -14\beta m$ or $k_1' \geq \beta m$. Now It is sufficient to consider the case when k_1' and k_2' are fixed and $-14\beta m \leq k_2' \leq k_1' \leq \beta m$.

Although the $|\eta|$ we consider here could be slightly worse, it is possible to be $2^{-\alpha m}$. The methods used in the χ^1_k case can be applied directly. Note that $\xi - \eta$ and $\eta/2$ are still not close in the case we are considering, therefore either $\nabla_\sigma\Phi^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}_i$ or $\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}_i$ is big. This fact allows us to rule out the case when all inputs have small spatial concentration.

From (4.26) in Lemma 4.3, we know that $\nabla_\sigma\Phi^{\mu,\tau,-\tau}_1$ still has a good lower bound of size $2^{-2\alpha m-2\beta m}$, see (6.22) and (6.28). Hence, as what we did in (6.20), we do integration by parts in “σ” to rule out the case when $\max\{j_1', j_2'\} \leq m + k_{2,-}' + k_{1,-}' - 10\beta m$ for $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,-\tau,i}_{k_1',k_2'}$, $i \in \{1,2\}$. For the case when $\max\{j_1', j_2'\} \geq m + k_{2,-}' + k_{1,-}' - 10\beta m$, estimate (6.23) still holds for the case we are considering.

From (4.27) and (4.28) in Lemma 4.3, we know that $\nabla_\sigma \Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}$ $(\nabla_\sigma \Phi_2^{\tau,\tau,\nu})$ and $\nabla_\eta \Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}$ $(\nabla_\eta \Phi_2^{\tau,\tau,\nu}$) still have a good lower bound of size $2^{-2\alpha m - 2\beta m}$. Hence, as what we did in (6.24), we can rule out the case when $\max\{j_1(j_2), j_1', j_2'\} \leq m + k_2 + k_2' - 10\beta m$ by doing integration by parts in "σ" when σ is away from $\eta/2$ $\big((\xi+\eta)/2\big)$ and do integration by parts in "η" when σ is close to $\eta/2$ $\big((\xi+\eta)/2\big)$ for $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\tau,1}_{k_1',k_2'}$ $\big(J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\tau,2}_{k_1',k_2'}\big)$. For the case when $\max\{j_1(j_2), j_1', j_2'\} \leq m + k_2 + k_2' - 10\beta m$, it is easy to verify that the estimate we did in (6.29) still holds. As we gain extra 2^{-m} but only pay the price of at most $2^{4\alpha m} = 2^{0.4m}$.

7. THE IMPROVED Z-NORM ESTIMATE: BAD TYPE PHASES

In previous section, we study the quadratic terms with good type phases, in which the largest two inputs have the same sign inside good phases. As a result, we do not actually see the high degeneracy of phases. Now, things become different in the bad type phases. The opposite sign of the largest two inputs will cause cancellations and high degeneracy of bad phases. For this case, delicate analysis of roles of the angles between the output and inputs is required.

7.1. **When $(k_1, k_2) \in \chi_k^1, (\mu, \nu) \in \{(-,+), (+,-)\}$.** Similar to what we did in subsection 6.1, we can first rule out the very high input frequency case and the very low output frequency case. For the rough multilinear estimates derived at the beginning of subsection 6.1, the type of phases does not play a role, hence we will derive the same result. To sum up, k, k_1, and j are fixed in the range as follows,

$$-(1+\delta)(m+j)/(2+\alpha) \leq k + 10 \leq k_1 \leq (1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(N_0-10) \leq \beta m, j \leq m + 20\delta m, \tag{7.1}$$

which is same as (6.1).

For fixed k and k_1 in above range, we dyadically localize the angle between ξ and $\nu\eta$ with threshold chosen to be $\bar{l} := 2k_{1,-}$ and have the following decomposition,

$$\mathcal{F}\Big[\int_{t_1}^{t_2} T^{\mu,\nu}(f_{k_1}(t), f_{k_2}(t))dt\Big](\xi) = \sum_{\bar{l}\leq l\leq 2} I_l^{\mu,\nu}, \quad I_l^{\mu,\nu} = \sum_{j_1\geq -k_{1,-}, j_2\geq -k_{2,-}} I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}, \tag{7.2}$$

where

$$I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)} \varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta) \widehat{f^\mu_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^\nu_{k_2,j_2}}(t,\eta)d\eta dt, \tag{7.3}$$

and $\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\cdot)$ is defined as follows,

$$\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(x) = \begin{cases} \psi_l(x) & \text{if } \bar{l} < l \leq 2 \\ \psi_{\leq \bar{l}}(x) & \text{if } l = \bar{l}. \end{cases} \tag{7.4}$$

In the following, we mainly estimate $I_l^{\mu,\nu}$, for fixed l, k and k_1, as there are at most m^3 cases in total, which is only a logarithmic loss.

7.1.1. *If* $\max\{m+l,-k-l\}+100\delta m \le j \le m+20\delta m$. For this case, we have $k \le -30\delta m$, otherwise $\max\{m+l,-k-l\}+100\delta m > m+20\delta m$. To deal with this case, an observation is that the estimate (6.3) can be improved if the angle between ξ and $\nu\eta$ is well localized. As a result, through integration by parts in " ξ", we can further rule out the case when $j \ge \max\{m+l,-k-l\}+100\delta m$.

- We first consider the case when $\min\{j_1,j_2\} \ge j-\delta m$. From (3.16) in Lemma 3.5 and (3.11) in Lemma 3.3, we can derive the following esitmate,

$$\sum_{\min\{j_1,j_2\}\ge j-\delta m} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}]\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{\min\{j_1,j_2\}\ge j-\delta m} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+k+k_{1,+}+k+l/2}$$

$$\times\|Q_{k_1,j_1}f\|_{L^2}\|Q_{k_2,j_2}f\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{(2+\alpha)k+m+2\delta m-j-2\alpha k_1+l/2}\epsilon_1^2$$

$$\lesssim 2^{(2+\alpha)k-l/2-2\alpha k_1+2\delta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{(1-\alpha)k+2\delta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.5}$$

- It remains to consider the case when $\min\{j_1,j_2\} \le j-\delta m$. For this case, we will mainly do integration by parts in "ξ" to see rapidly decay. Recall that $\mu\nu = -$. From (4.9), the following estimate holds,

$$|\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\varphi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) = \Big|\Lambda'(|\xi|)\frac{\xi}{|\xi|} - \mu\Lambda'(|\xi-\eta|)\frac{\xi-\eta}{|\xi-\eta|}\Big|\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \lesssim 2^l,$$

hence the following estimate holds as $j \ge m+l+100\delta m$,

$$|\nabla_\xi[x\cdot\xi + s\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)]|\varphi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))\varphi^k_j(x) \sim 2^j. \tag{7.6}$$

For every time of integration by part in ξ, we can gain 2^{-j} by paying the price of at most $\max\{2^{\min\{j_1,j_2\}}$, $2^{-k-l}\}$, here 2^{-k-l} comes from the fact that ∇_ξ might hit the angular cutoff function $\varphi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))$ or the symbol $a_{\mu,\nu}(t,x,\xi,\eta)$ (see (6.2)). As $j \ge -k-l+100\delta m$ and $\min\{j_1,j_2\} \le j-\delta m$, we can see that the total gain of each step of integration by parts in "ξ" is at least $2^{-\delta m}$ and we can keep doing this process to see rapidly decay. More precisely, the following estimate holds,

$$\big|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}](x)\big|\varphi^k_j(x) \lesssim 2^{-10m}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2},$$

therefore, it's easy to see the following estimate holds

$$\sum_{\min\{j_1,j_2\}\le j-\delta m} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}]\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-2\delta j}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.7}$$

7.1.2. *If* $j \le \max\{m+l,-k-l\}+100\delta m$, $k+2k_1 \le -m+\beta m$, *and* $k+2l \le -m+2\beta m$. For this case, we have $j \le -k-l+2\beta m+100\delta m$ and $k \le -m/3+\beta m$. From (3.16) in Lemma 3.5, (5.20) and (5.22) in Lemma 5.4, the following estimate holds,

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_l]\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+k+k+k_1+l}\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|\widehat{f_{k_2}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi}$$

$$\lesssim 2^{(1+\alpha)k+m+2k_1+3\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{(1+\alpha)k+2k_1+3\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

Remark 7.1. Note that, if without the improved L^2 estimates (5.20) and (5.22) in Lemma 5.4, it is impossible to easily close the argument for the case we are considering. If one uses estimates (5.7) and (5.8) instead, then we only have the following estimate,

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_l]\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{(1+\alpha)k+2k_1-2\alpha k_1+m+3\beta m}\epsilon_0,$$

which is not sufficient when $k \ge 2k_1$ and $k+2k_1 \approx -m+\beta m$.

7.1.3. *If* $j\leq \max\{m+l,-k-l\}+100\delta m$, $k+2k_1\leq -m+\beta m$, *and* $k+2l\geq -m+2\beta m$. For this case, we have $j\leq m+l+100\delta m$ and $k\leq -m/3+\beta m$. When do integration by parts in "η", it is not a problem anymore when ∇_η hits the symbol $\tilde{m}_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)$(see (6.12)), as $k+2l\geq -m+2\beta m$. See (4.19) in Lemma 4.2.

- We first consider the case when $\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+k-k_1+l-4\beta m$. For this case, by using estimate (3.16) in Lemma 3.5 and putting the input with higher spatial concentration in L^2 and the other one in L^∞_ξ, we have the following estimate if $l\leq 2\alpha k_1$,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+k-k_1+l-4\beta m}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}]\|_{B_{k,j}}\lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+k-k_1+l-4\beta m} 2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j+k+k+k_1+l}$$
$$\times 2^{-\max\{j_1,j_2\}-2\alpha k_1}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_Z\lesssim 2^{(1+\alpha)k+(2-2\alpha)k_1+l+m+4\beta m}\epsilon_1^2$$
$$\lesssim 2^{\alpha k+(k+2k_1)+m+4\beta m}\epsilon_1^2\lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

It remains to consider the case when $l\geq 2\alpha k_1$. From Lemma 3.2, the following estimate holds,

$$\|q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\varphi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}}\lesssim 2^{k-3l+\beta m},$$

as when $\nabla_{\xi,\eta}$ hits the angular cutoff function once, we lose extra 2^{-l}. As we need to take derivative three times, which explains 2^{-3l} in above estimate. From L^2-L^∞ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1, we have the following estimate after putting the input with higher spatial localization in L^2 and the other one in L^∞,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+k-k_1+l-4\beta m}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}]\|_{B_{k,j}}\lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+k-k_1+l-4\beta m} 2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j}$$
$$\times 2^{k-3l+\beta m-m-2\alpha k_1-\max\{j_1,j_2\}-6k_{1,+}}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_Z\lesssim 2^{\alpha k+(1-2\alpha)k_1-3l+6\beta m}\epsilon_1^2$$
$$\lesssim 2^{\alpha(k+2k_1)+7\beta m}\epsilon_0\lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-2\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

- We proceed to consider the case when $\max\{j_1,j_2\}\leq m+k-k_1+l-4\beta m$. For this case, we do integration by parts in " η" to see rapidly decay. From (4.19) in Lemma 4.2 and (4.10) in Lemma 4.1, we can see that the net gain is at least $2^{-m}\max\{2^{-k-2l+\beta m}, 2^{\max\{j_1,j_2\}-k+k_1-l+3\beta m}\}$, which is less than $2^{-\beta m}$, for each time of integration by parts in "η". Therefore, we can keep doing this process to see rapidly decay.

7.1.4. *If* $j\leq \max\{m+l,-k-l\}+100\delta m$, $k+2k_1\geq -m+\beta m$, *and* $k+2l\leq -m+2\beta m$. For this case, we have $j\leq -k-l+\beta m+100\delta m$, $k\leq -m/5+\beta m$ and $l\leq k_1+\beta m/2$. For this case, we do integration by parts in time first. The formulas are very similar as in (6.5) and (6.13). We only need to add angular cutoff function $\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))$ into the symbol. For readers' convenience, we still state them in details as follows,

$$I^{\mu,\nu}_l=\sum_{i=1,2}\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}+J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2},\quad J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}=\sum_{k_1',k_2'\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{\mu',\kappa'\in\{+,-\}}J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l;k_1',k_2'}+\mathrm{JR}^i_{l;k_1,k_2},\quad i\in\{1,2\},\tag{7.8}$$

$$J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l;k_1',k_2'}:=\sum_{j_1'\geq -k'_{1,-},j_2'\geq -k'_{2,-},j_i\geq -k_{i,-}}H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l,j_i;j_1',j_2'},,\quad \mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}=\sum_{j_1\geq -k_{1,-},j_2\geq -k_{2,-}}\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2},\tag{7.9}$$

$$H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l;j_1',j_2'}=\sum_{j_i\geq -k_{i,-}}H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l,j_i;j_1',j_2'},\quad H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l,j_i;j_1'}=\sum_{j_2'\geq -k'_{2,-}}H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l,j_i;j_1',j_2'},\quad i\in\{1,2\},\tag{7.10}$$

where

$$\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2} = (-1)^{i-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it_i\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(t_i,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}_{k_2,j_2}}(t_i,\eta)m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))d\eta,$$

$$H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l,j_i;j_1',j_2'} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))$$

$$\times\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\kappa}_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma)d\eta d\sigma dt,$$

$$H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l,j_i;j_1',j_2'} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it_i\Phi_2^{\tau,\kappa,\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))$$

$$\times\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\xi-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\kappa}_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}_{k_2,j_2}}(t,\eta)d\eta d\sigma dt,$$

$$\mathrm{JR}^1_{l;k_1,k_2} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{f^{\mu}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{\mathcal{R}'^{\nu}}(t,\eta)m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))d\eta dt,$$

$$\mathrm{JR}^2_{l;k_1,k_2} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{\mathcal{R}'^{\mu}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}}(t,\eta)m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))d\eta dt,$$

where $m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)$, $m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$, and $m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ are same as in (5.3), (6.16), and (6.17).

From Lemma 3.2, (3.11) in Lemma 3.3, (4.8) in Lemma 4.1, and (4.18) in Lemma 4.2, the following estimates hold,

$$\|m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\varphi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}} \lesssim 2^{k-k-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}+2k_{1,+}} \lesssim 2^{-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}+2\beta m}, \tag{7.11}$$

$$\|m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\varphi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} \lesssim \max\{2^{k-k-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}+2k_{1,+}-3k_{1,-}},$$

$$2^{k-k-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}+2k_{1,+}-3l}\} \lesssim 2^{-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}-6k_{1,-}+2\beta m}. \tag{7.12}$$

- *Estimate of the endpoint case.* From (3.16) in Lemma 3.5, (5.20) and (5.22) in Lemma 5.4, and (7.11), the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{i=1,2}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}]\|_Z \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+j-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}+2\beta m+k+k_1+l}\|\widehat{f_{k_1}}(\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi}\|f_{k_2}\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim 2^{\alpha k+3\beta m}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+3\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

- *Estimate of $J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}$, $i\in\{1,2\}$.* From (3.16) in Lemma 3.5, (5.21) in Lemma 5.4, (5.22), and (7.11) the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{i=1,2}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{i=1,2} 2^{\alpha k+m+j-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}+2\beta m+k+k_1+l}\|\widehat{f_{k_i}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi}\|\partial_t f_{k_{3-i}}\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim 2^{\alpha k+3\beta m}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

7.1.5. *If $j \le \max\{m+l, -k-l\} + 100\delta m$, $k + 2k_1 \ge -m + \beta m$, and $k + 2l \ge -m + 2\beta m$.* For this case, we have $j \le m + l + 100\delta m$ and $k_1 \ge -m/3$. Same as the previous case, we do integration by parts in time first.

- *Estimate of the endpoint case.* Again, as $k + 2l \ge -m + 2\beta m$, it is not problematic when doing integration by parts in "η". Same as before, we can first rule out the case when $\max\{j_1, j_2\} \le m + k - k_1 + l - 4\beta m$ by doing integration by parts in "η" many times.

It remains to consider the case when $\max\{j_1, j_2\} \ge m + k - k_1 + l - 4\beta m$. From (3.16) in Lemma 3.5 and (7.11), the following estimate holds after putting the input with higher spatial concentration in L^2 and the other one in L^∞_ξ.

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\ge m+k-k_1+l-4\beta m} \sum_{i=1,2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2}]\|_Z$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\ge m+k-k_1+l-4\beta m} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +j-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}+2\beta m+k+k_1+l-\max\{j_1,j_2\}-6k_{1,+}-2\alpha k_1}$$

$$\times \|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z \|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_Z \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+2k_1+l-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}-2\alpha k_1+6\beta m}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+(1-2\alpha)k_1+6\beta m}\epsilon_0.$$

From above estimate, we can rule out the case when $k_1 \le -7\beta m$ or $k \le -70\beta m$. It is sufficient to consider the case when $k_1 \ge -7\beta m$ and $k \ge -70\beta m$. From (7.12), the following estimate holds,

$$\|m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\varphi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} \lesssim 2^{-8k_{1,-}+2\beta m} \lesssim 2^{58\beta m}. \tag{7.13}$$

From $L^2 - L^\infty$ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and (7.13), the following estimate holds after putting the input with higher spatial localization in L^2 and the other one in L^∞.

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\ge m+k-k_1+l-4\beta m} \sum_{i=1,2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2}]\|_Z$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\ge m+k-k_1+l-4\beta m} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +j+58\beta m-\max\{j_1,j_2\}-m-2\alpha k_1}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z \|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_Z$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-m-(1-\alpha)k+(1-2\alpha)k_1+70\beta m}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-m+140\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

- *Estimate of $J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}$, $i \in \{1,2\}$.* As before, since the decay rate of Z-norm of $\mathcal{R}'$ is 2^{-m}. With minor modification, we can estimate of $\mathrm{JR}^1_{l;k_1,k_2}$ and $\mathrm{JR}^2_{l;k_1,k_2}$ in the same way as we did for $\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}$. We omit details here.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $k_2' = \min\{k_1', k_2'\}$. From (4.6) and (4.7) in Lemma 4.1, the size of $\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)$ is either $2^k \max\{2^{-k_+/2+2k_{1,-}}, 2^{-k_{1,+}/2+2l}\}$ or $2^{k-k_+/2}$, hence we can put a cutoff function $\psi_0(2^{-\kappa}\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta))$ inside the symbols $m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)$, $m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$, and $m_2^{\tau,\kappa,\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$, with 2^κ chosen to be either $2^k \max\{2^{-k_+/2+2k_{1,-}}, 2^{-k_{1,+}/2+2l}\}$ or $2^{k-k_+/2}$. This fact enables us to use the Lemma 3.6.

From (3.21) in Lemma 3.6, after putting $f_{k_i}(t)$ in L^∞ and $T^{\tau,\kappa}(f_{k_1'}, f_{k_2'})$ in L^2, the following estimate holds

$$\sum_{i=1,2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l;k_1',k_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim \sup_{|\lambda|\le 2^{\beta m}} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+2\beta m}\|e^{-i(t+2^{-k-2l}\lambda)}f_{k_1}(t)\|_{L^\infty}$$

$$\times 2^{k_1}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2} + 2^{-10m+k+\alpha k+m+j-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim \min\{2^{(1-2\alpha)k_2'+3\beta m}, 2^{(1-2\alpha)k_2'+m+3\beta m-(N_0-8)k_{1,+}'}\}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.14}$$

For the second bound of above estimate, we used again the fact that $\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\lesssim 2^{k_1'}\|f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}\lesssim 2^{k_1'-N_0k_{1,+}'}\epsilon_0$. From (7.14), we can rule out the case when $k_1'\geq \beta m$ or $k_2'\leq -4\beta m$. Now, it is sufficient to consider fixed k_1' and k_2' such that $-4\beta m\leq k_2'\leq k_1'\leq \beta m$.

We first consider the case when $k_1\leq -10\beta m$. As $-4\beta m\leq k_2'\leq k_1'\leq \beta m$, we know that $|\eta|\ll|\eta-\sigma|$(or $|\xi-\eta|\ll|\xi-\sigma|$). Hence, from (4.10) and (4.11) in Lemma 4.1, $\nabla_\sigma\Phi^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}$ always has a good lower bound of size $2^{k_1+k_1'-2\beta m}\gtrsim 2^{-m/3-2\beta m}$. From (4.17) and (4.19) in Lemma 4.2, we know that the net gain of doing integration by parts in "σ" is at least $\max\{2^{-m+\max\{j_1',j_2'\}-k_1-k_1'+3\beta m}$, $2^{-m-\min\{k_1,k_2'\}-4k_1'+5\beta m}\}$, which is less than $2^{-\beta m}$. Therefore, we can do integration by parts in "σ" many times to see rapidly decay to rule out the case when $\max\{j_1',j_2'\}\leq m+k_1+k_1'-4\beta m$.

Next, we consider the case when $k_1\geq -10\beta m$. As k_1 is not small, same as what we did in the good type phase setting, either $\nabla_\sigma\Phi^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}$ or $\nabla_\eta\Phi^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}$ has a good lower bound. Through doing integration by parts in "σ" or doing integration by parts in "σ" and "η", we can rule out the case when $\max\{j_i,j_1',j_2'\}\leq m+k_1+k_1'-10\beta m$.

Therefore, in whichever case, we can always rule out the case when $\max\{j_i,j_1',j_2'\}\leq m+k_1+k_1'-10\beta m$. It remains to consider the case when $\max\{j_i,j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_1+k_1'-10\beta m$. For this case, we use estimate (3.21) in Lemma 3.6. After putting the input with the maximum spatial concentration in L^2 and the other two inputs in L^∞, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{i=1,2}\sum_{\max\{j_i,j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_1+k_1'-10\beta m}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l,j_i;j_1',j_2'}]\|_Z$$

$$\lesssim\sum_{\max\{j_i,j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_1+k_1'-10\beta m}\big(2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+2\beta m}2^{-m-\alpha k_1}$$

$$+2^{-10m+k+\alpha k+m+j-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+2\beta m}\big)\times 2^{k_1}2^{-\max\{j_i,j_1',j_2'\}-m-\alpha(k_1'+k_2')}\|f_{k_1',j_1'}\|_Z\|f_{k_i,j_i}\|_Z\|f_{k_2',j_2'}\|_Z$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-m-k_1-(1+\alpha)(k_1'+k_2')+24\beta m}\epsilon_0\lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.15}$$

In above estimate, we used the fact that $k_1\geq -m/3$.

7.2. **When** $(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^2,(\mu,\nu)\in\{(+,+),(+,-)\}$**.** Recall that $k_2=\min\{k_1,k_2\}$. Same as what we did in subsection 6.2, we can use the rough estimates to rule out the very high frequency case, the very low frequency case and the very high spatial localization j. To sum up, from now on k, k_1, k_2, and j are restricted in the ranges as follows

$$-(1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(2-\alpha)\leq k_2\leq k-10,\quad j\leq m+20\delta m, \tag{7.16}$$

$$-(1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(4-\alpha)\leq k\leq (1+\delta)(m+j+10\delta m)/(N_0-10)\leq\beta m. \tag{7.17}$$

For fixed k_1 and k_2 in above range, we dyadically localize the angle between ξ and $\nu\eta$ with the threshold $\bar{l}$ chosen to be $2k_{1,-}$ and then spatially localize two inputs as in (7.3). For simplicity, we use same notations listed in (7.2), (7.8) and (7.9), but one should keep in mind that now $(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^2$ instead of χ_k^1.

7.2.1. *If* $\max\{m+l, \min\{-k_2-l, m\}\} + 100\delta m \le j \le m + 20\delta m$. The case when $j \ge m + 100\delta m$ is already considered. We only have to consider the case when $k_2 + l \ge -m$, $j \ge \max\{m+l, -k_2 - l\} + 100\delta m$ and $k_1 \le -20\delta m$. Note that k_1 and k_2 are not comparable in the case we are considering. Since ∇_ξ might hit $\widehat{f_{k_1,j_1}}(\xi-\eta)$ when doing integration by parts in ξ, it is problematic when $j_1 \ge j_2$. So, if $j_1 \ge j_2$, we do change of coordinates to switch the role of $\xi - \eta$ and η. However, in any case, the following estimate holds,

$$|\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) = \Big|\Lambda'(|\xi|)\frac{\xi}{|\xi|} - \Lambda'(|\xi-\eta|)\frac{\xi-\eta}{|\xi-\eta|}\Big|\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \lesssim 2^l.$$

Recall that $j \ge \max\{m+l, -k_2-l\} + 100\delta m$, by doing integration by parts in ξ once, we gain 2^{-j} by paying the price of $\max\{2^{\min\{j_1,j_2\}}, 2^{-k_2-l}\}$, where 2^{-k_2-l} comes from the fact that ∇_ξ might hit the angular cutoff function or $a_{\mu,\nu}(t,x,\xi-\eta)$ (see (6.2)). We can rule out the case when $\min\{j_1,j_2\} \le j - \delta m$ by doing integration by parts in ξ many times. For the case when $\min\{j_1,j_2\} \ge j - \delta m$, from (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{\min\{j_1,j_2\}\ge j-\delta m} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}]\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{\min\{j_1,j_2\}\ge j-\delta m} 2^{\alpha k + 6k_+ + m + j + k + k_{1,+} + k_2 + l/2}$$

$$\times \|Q_{k_1,j_1} f\|_{L^2} \|Q_{k_2,j_2} f\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{k+(1-\alpha)k_2 + m + 2\delta m - j + l/2}\epsilon_1^2$$

$$\lesssim 2^{k+(1-\alpha)k_2 - l/2 + 2\delta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{(1-\alpha)k + 2\delta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m - \delta j}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.18}$$

We can summarize the result in this subsubsection and the result in subsubsection 7.1.1 as the following lemma,

Lemma 7.2. *Under the bootstrap assumption* (2.12) *and the improved energy estimate* (2.13), *the following estimate holds if* $(k_1, k_2, \mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^k_{bad}$,

$$\|Q_{k,j}\Big[\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\nu}_{k_2}}(t,\eta)q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))d\eta\big]\Big]\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim 2^{(1-2\alpha)k - m - j + 2\delta m}\epsilon_0, \quad \text{if } j \ge \max\{m+l, -k-l, -k_2-l\} + 100\delta m \text{ and } \bar{l} \ge 2k_{1,-}. \tag{7.19}$$

Proof. One can redo above argument and the argument in subsubsection 7.1.1 to see the lemma holds. We keep the second estimate in (7.5) and (7.18) instead of the last estimate for (7.19). □

7.2.2. *If* $j \le \max\{m+l, \min\{-k_2-l, m\}\} + 100\delta m$, $(2-2\alpha)k_2 \le -m - 20\beta m$, *and* $k_2 + 2l \le -m + 4\beta m$. For this case, we have $j \le \min\{-k_2 - l + 4\beta m, m\} + 100\delta m$. As k_1 and k_2 are not comparable in the case we are considering, it turns out that whether j_2 is the smaller one between j_1 and j_2 makes a difference.

- We first consider the case when $j_2 \le j_1$. Recall that $j_2 \ge -k_2$. Therefore, from (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{j_2\le j_1} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{-k_2\le j_2\le j_1} 2^{\alpha k + 6k_+ + m + j + k_1 + k_{1,+} + k_2 + l/2}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim 2^{12\beta m + m + k_1 - l/2 + (2-\alpha)k_2}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m - \delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

- We proceed to consider the case when $j_1 \leq j_2$. For this case, we can do better for j. More precisely, as $j_1 \leq j_2$, it is not necessary to do change of coordinates to switch the role of $\xi - \eta$ and η. As a result, the following estimate holds,

$$|\nabla_\xi \Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)|\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) = |\Lambda'(|\xi|)\frac{\xi}{|\xi|} - \Lambda'(|\xi-\eta|)\frac{\xi-\eta}{|\xi-\eta|}|\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)) \lesssim 2^{k_2-k_1+l}.$$

Hence, we can further rule out the case when $\max\{m+(1-\alpha)(k_2-k_1)+l, -k_1-l\}+3\beta m \leq j \leq \max\{m+l,-k_2-l\}+100\delta m$ by run the argument used in subsubsection 7.2.1 again. Use similar estimate used in (7.18), we can rule out the case when $j_1 \geq j-\delta m$. Use integration by parts in "ξ" many times, we can rule out the case when $j_1 \leq j-\delta m$. Note that the price to pay is 2^{-k_1-l} instead of 2^{-k_2-l} when ∇_ξ hits $a_{\mu,\nu}(t,x,\xi,\eta)$. This fact is crucial here. Using (4.24), we know the size of numerator changes from $2^{k_2-k_1+l}$ to $2^{k_2-2k_1}$ when ∇_ξ hits $a_{\mu,\nu}(t,x,\xi,\eta)$. Hence we at most lose 2^{-k_1-l} when ∇_ξ hits $a_{\mu,\nu}(t,x,\xi,\eta)$.

Hence, it remains to consider the case when $j \leq \max\{m+(1-\alpha)(k_2-k_1)+l,-k_1-l\}+3\beta m$. From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, (5.20) in Lemma 5.4, and (5.22), the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{j_1\leq j_2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{j_1\leq j_2} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+k_1+k_{1,+}+k_1+k_2+l}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^1}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2}$$
$$\lesssim \max\{2^{7\beta m+2m+(3-2\alpha)k_2+k_1+2l}\epsilon_0, 2^{7\beta m+m+(2-\alpha)k_2+k_1}\epsilon_0\} \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

7.2.3. *If* $j \leq \max\{m+l,\min\{-k_2-l,m\}\}+100\delta m$, $(2-2\alpha)k_2 \leq -m-20\beta m$, *and* $k_2+2l \geq -m+4\beta m$. For this case, we have $j \leq m+l+100\delta m$ and $l \geq -m/4$. Same as the previous case, whether j_2 is the smaller one between j_1 and j_2 makes a difference. We separate into two cases as follows.

- We first consider the case when $j_2 \leq j_1$. If moreover $j_1 \leq m+l-4\beta m$, then we can do integration by parts in "η" many times to see rapidly decay. Because the net gain of doing integration by parts in η once is at least $2^{-m}\max\{2^{\max\{j_1,j_2\}-l+3\beta m}, 2^{-k_2-2l+\beta m}\}$, which is less than $2^{-\beta m}$. It remains to consider the case when $j_1 \geq m+l-4\beta m$. From (3.15) in Lemma 5.4, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{j_2\leq j_1, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_1} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{j_2\leq j_1, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_1} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+k_1+k_{1,+}+2k_2+l}$$
$$\times \|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^1} \lesssim 2^{m+(2-\alpha)k_2+k_1+l+6\beta m} \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

- We proceed to consider the case when $j_1 \leq j_2$. As before, we can do better for j for this case. As a result, we can rule out the case when $\max\{m+(1-\alpha)(k_2-k_1)+l,-k_1-l\}+3\beta m \leq j \leq \max\{m+l,-k_2-l\}+100\delta m$ by running the argument used in subsubsection 7.2.1 again. It is sufficient to consider the case when $j \leq \max\{m+(1-\alpha)(k_2-k_1)+l,-k_1-l\}+3\beta m$. Moreover, we can further rule out the case when $j_2 \leq m+l-4\beta m$ by doing integration by parts in "η" many times to see rapidly decay. Hence, it remains to consider the case when $j \leq \max\{m+(1-\alpha)(k_2-k_1)+l,-k_1-l\}+3\beta m$ and $j_2 \geq m+l-4\beta m$. For this case, we use (3.15) in Lemma 3.2 and (3.12) in Lemma 3.3 to derive the following estimate,

$$\sum_{j_1\leq j_2, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[I^{\mu,\nu}_{l;j_1,j_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{j_1\leq j_2, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_2} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+k_1+k_{1,+}+k_1+k_2+l}$$
$$\times \|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^1}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \max\{2^{m+(2-2\alpha)k_2+k_1+l+12\beta m}, 2^{12\beta m+(1-\alpha)k_2+k_1-l}\}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

In above estimate, we used the fact that $k_2 \leq -m/(2-2\alpha)-12\beta m$ and $l \geq -m/4$.

7.2.4. *If* $j \leq \max\{m+l, \min\{-k_2-l, m\}\} + 100\delta m$, $(2-2\alpha)k_2 \geq -m - 20\beta m$, *and* $k_2 + 2l \leq -m + 4\beta m$. For this case, we have $j \leq -k_2 - l + 100\delta m + 4\beta m$, $l \leq -m/5$ and $k_1 \leq -m/10$. We first do integration by parts in time and have the same equality as in (7.8).

From Lemma 3.2, (3.11) in Lemma 3.3, (4.8) in Lemma 4.1, and (4.18) in Lemma 4.2, the following estimates hold,

$$\|m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\varphi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))\|_{L^\infty_{\xi,\eta}} \lesssim 2^{k_1-k_2-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}+2k_{1,+}}, \tag{7.20}$$

$$\|m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\varphi_l(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} \lesssim \max\{2^{k_1-k_2-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}+2k_{1,+}-3k_{1,-}},$$
$$2^{k_1-k_2-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}+2k_{1,+}-3l}\} \lesssim 2^{k_1-k_2-2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}-6k_{1,-}+2k_{1,+}}. \tag{7.21}$$

- *Estimate of the endpoint case.* From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, (5.20) and (5.22) in Lemma 5.4, and (7.20), the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{i=1,2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{i=1,2} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ + j - k_1 - k_2 + k_1 + k_2 + l} \|\widehat{f_{k_1}}(t_i,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} \|f_{k_2}(t_i)\|_{L^2}$$
$$\lesssim 2^{\alpha k + 4\beta m + 200\delta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m - \delta j}.$$

- *Estimate of* $J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}$, $i \in \{1,2\}$. As usual, with minor modification, we can estimate of $\mathrm{JR}^1_{l;k_1,k_2}$ and $\mathrm{JR}^2_{l;k_1,k_2}$ in the same way as we did for $\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}$. We omit details here and proceed to the estimate of $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l;k'_1,k'_2}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $k'_2 = \min\{k'_1, k'_2\}$.

From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, (5.20) and (5.22) in Lemma 5.4, and (7.20), the following estimate holds after putting $T^{\tau,\kappa}(f_{k'_1}, f_{k'_2})$ in L^2 and the other one in L^∞_ξ

$$\sum_{i=1,2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l;k'_1,k'_2}]\|_Z \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+m+j-k_1-k_2+k_1+k_2+l} \|\widehat{f_{k_1}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} 2^{k_2+k'_{1,+}} \|e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k'_1}\|_{L^\infty} \|f_{k'_2}\|_{L^2}$$
$$+ 2^{\alpha k+m+j-k_1-k_2+2k_2+l} \|\widehat{f_{k_2}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} 2^{k_1+k'_{1,+}} \|e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k'_1}\|_{L^\infty} \|f_{k'_2}\|_{L^2}$$
$$\lesssim \min\{2^{\alpha k+(1-\alpha)k'_2-4k'_{1,+}+3\beta m}, 2^{m+\alpha k+(1-\alpha)k'_2+k'_1-N_0k'_{1,+}+3\beta m}\}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.22}$$

With above estimate, we can rule out the case when $k'_2 \leq -10\beta m$ or $k'_1 \geq \beta m$. It remains to consider fixed k'_1 and k'_2 such that $-10\beta m \leq k'_2 \leq k'_1 \leq \beta m$. Recall that $k_1 \leq -m/10$. Hence, either $|\eta| \ll |\eta - \sigma|$ or $|\xi - \eta| \ll |\xi - \sigma|$, which implies that $\nabla_\sigma \Phi^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}_i(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ always has a good lower bound. Hence, we can rule out the case when $\max\{j'_1, j'_2\} \leq m + k_2 + k'_1 - 4\beta m$ by doing integration by parts in "σ" many times.

It remains to consider the case when $\max\{j'_1, j'_2\} \geq m + k_2 + k'_1 - 4\beta m$. From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, the following estimate holds after first putting $T^{\tau,\kappa}(f_{k'_1,j'_1}, f_{k'_2,j'_2})$ in L^2 and then putting the input with higher spatial localization in L^2 and the other one in L^∞_x,

$$\sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+k_2+k'_1-4\beta m} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l;k'_1,j'_1,k'_2,j'_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+k_2+k'_1-4\beta m} 2^{\alpha k+m+j}$$
$$\times 2^{-k_1-k_2+k_1+k_2+l} \|\widehat{f_{k_1}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} 2^{k_2+k'_{1,+}} 2^{-m-\alpha k'_1-\alpha k'_2-\max\{j'_1,j'_2\}} \|f_{k'_1,j'_1}\|_Z \|f_{k'_2,j'_2}\|_Z$$
$$+ 2^{\alpha k+m+j-k_1-k_2+2k_2+l} \|\widehat{f_{k_2}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} 2^{k_1+k'_{1,+}} 2^{-m-\alpha k'_1-\alpha k'_2-\max\{j'_1,j'_2\}} \|f_{k'_1,j'_1}\|_Z \|f_{k'_2,j'_2}\|_Z$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-m-(1+\alpha)k_2-(1+2\alpha)k'_2+4\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

7.2.5. *If* $j \leq \max\{m+l, \min\{-k_2-l, m\}\} + 100\delta m$, $(2-2\alpha)k_2 \geq -m-20\beta m$, *and* $k_2+2l \geq -m+4\beta m$. For this case, we have $j \leq m+l+100\delta m$. We do integration by parts in time and have the same identity as in (7.8).

- *Estimate of the endpoint case.* (i) We first consider the case when $j_2 \leq j_1$. By doing integration by parts in "η" many times, we can rule out the case when $j_1 \leq m+l-4\beta m$. It remains to consider the case when $j_1 \geq m+l-4\beta m$. From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, the following estimate holds if $k_2 \leq -30\beta m$

$$\sum_{j_2\leq j_1, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_1} \sum_{i=1,2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{j_2\leq j_1, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_1} 2^{\alpha k+6k_++j+k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}$$
$$\times 2^{2\beta m+2k_2+l}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^1} \lesssim 2^{(1-\alpha)k_2+15\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

If $k_2 \geq -30\beta m$, then we can use Lemma 3.2, L^2-L^∞ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and (7.21) to derive the following estimate,

$$\sum_{j_2\leq j_1, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_1} \sum_{i=1,2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{j_2\leq j_1, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_1} 2^{\alpha k+6k_++j-k_2-2k_1-3l}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^2}$$
$$\times \|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-m-(1+\alpha)k_2-2k_1-3l}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-m-10k_2}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

(ii) We proceed to consider the case when $j_1 \leq j_2$. By running the argument used in subsubsection 7.2.1 again, we can rule out the case when $\max\{m+(1-\alpha)(k_2-k_1)+l, -k_1-l\}+3\beta m \leq j \leq \max\{m+l, -k_2-l\}+100\delta m$. Moreover, by using integration by parts in "η" many times, we can further rule out the case when $j_2 \leq m+l-4\beta m$. Therefore, it is sufficient to consider the case when $j \leq \max\{m+(1-\alpha)(k_2-k_1)+l, -k_1-l\}+3\beta m = m+(1-\alpha)(k_2-k_1)+l+3\beta m$ and $j_2 \geq m+l-4\beta m$. From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, the following estimate holds if $k_2 \leq -30\beta m$

$$\sum_{j_1\leq j_2, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_2} \sum_{i=1,2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{j_1\leq j_2, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_2} 2^{\alpha k+j+6k_++k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}$$
$$\times 2^{2\beta m+k_1+k_2+l}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^1}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{(1-2\alpha)k_2+15\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

If $k_2 \geq -30\beta m$, then we can use L^2-L^∞ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and (7.21) to derive the following estimate,

$$\sum_{j_1\leq j_2, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_2} \sum_{i=1,2} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{End}^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,j_1,k_2,j_2}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{j_1\leq j_2, m+l-4\beta m\leq j_2} 2^{\alpha k+j+6k_+-k_2-2k_1-3l+2\beta m}$$
$$\times \|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-m-(1+\alpha)k_2-2k_1-3l+15\beta m}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-m-10k_2+15\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

- *Estimate of* $J^{\mu,\nu,i}_{l;k_1,k_2}$, $i \in \{1,2\}$. Same as before, we omit the detailed proof of $\mathrm{JR}^1_{l;k_1,k_2}$ and $\mathrm{JR}^2_{l;k_1,k_2}$ here and proceed to the estimate of $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l;k_1',k_2'}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $k_2' = \min\{k_1', k_2'\}$.

From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5 and (5.22) in Lemma 5.4, the following estimates hold,

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l;k_1',k_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j+k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+k_1+k_2+l}$$
$$\times \|\widehat{f_{k_1}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi}2^{k_2}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}. \tag{7.23}$$
$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l;k_1',k_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j+k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+2k_2+l}$$
$$\times \|\widehat{f_{k_2}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi}2^{k_1}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}. \tag{7.24}$$

From (7.23) and (7.24), the following estimate holds if $k_2' \leq -2m$ or $k_1' \geq 2\beta m$,

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l;k_1',k_2'}]\|_Z + \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l;k_1',k_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim \min\{2^{m+(1-\alpha)k_2'+10\beta m},$$
$$2^{2m+(1-\alpha)k_2'+10\beta m-(N_0-8)k'_{1,+}}\}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-2\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

Therefore, now it's sufficient to consider the case when k_1' and k_2' are fixed and $-2m \leq k_2' \leq k_1' \leq 2\beta m$.

We first estimate $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l;k_1',k_2'}$. For this case, we have $|k_2 - k_1'| \leq 5$ if $k_1' \geq k_2' + 5$ and $k_2 \leq k_1' + 5$ if $k_1' \leq k_2' + 5$.

Case 1**:** If $k_2' - 3\beta m \leq k_2$. From (3.21) in Lemma 3.6, after putting $T^{\nu\tau,\nu\kappa}(f_{k_1'}, f_{k_2'})$ in L^2 and the other one in L^∞, the following estimate holds,

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l;k_1',k_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim \sup_{|\lambda|\leq 2^{\beta m}} 2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j+k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}2^{(k_1-k_2)/2}2^{k_2}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}$$
$$\times\|e^{-i(t+2^{-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}\lambda)}f_{k_1}(t)\|_{L^\infty} + 2^{-10m+k+\alpha k+m+j+k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+k_2}$$
$$\times\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{k_2'-\alpha k_1'+(k_1-k_2)/2+4\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{(1-2\alpha)k_2'/2+k_1/2+4\beta m}\epsilon_0.$$

From above estimate, we can rule out the case when $k_2' \leq -12\beta m$. It remains to consider the case when $k_2' \geq -12\beta m$. For this case, we have $k_2 \geq -15\beta m$. All frequencies are relatively big. From (4.26), (4.27), and (4.28) in Lemma 4.3, we know that either $\nabla_\sigma\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ or $\nabla_\eta\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ is big. Recall (7.9). Through doing integration by parts in "σ" or doing integration by parts in "σ" and "η", we can rule out the case when $\max\{j_1, j_1', j_2'\} \leq m + k_2 + k_2' - 10\beta m$.

Now, it's sufficient to consider the case when $\max\{j_1, j_1', j_2'\} \geq m + k_2 + k_2' - 10\beta m$. From (3.21) in Lemma 3.6, we put the input with the maximum spatial concentration in L^2 and the other two inputs in L^∞. As a result, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1,j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_2+k_2'-10\beta m}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l,j_1;j_1',j_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_2+k_2'-10\beta m} 2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j}$$
$$\times 2^{k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}2^{(k_1-k_2)/2}2^{-m-\alpha k_1}2^{k_2-m-\max\{j_1,j_1',j_2'\}-2\alpha k_2'}\|f_{k_1',j_1'}\|_Z\|f_{k_2',j_2'}\|_Z\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z$$
$$+2^{-10m+k+m+j+k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+k_2}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z 2^{-m-\max\{j_1,j_1',j_2'\}-2\alpha k_2'}\|f_{k_1',j_1'}\|_Z\|f_{k_2',j_2'}\|_Z$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-m-3k_2'+20\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

Case 2**:** If $k_2' - 3\beta m \geq k_2$ and $(k_1', k_2', \nu\tau, \nu\kappa) \in \mathcal{P}^{k_2}_{good}$. A key observation is that the phase is relatively big. More precisely,

$$2^{k_2'-k'_{2,+}/2} \lesssim 2^{k_2'-k'_{2,+}/2} - 2^{k_2+2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}} \leq |\Phi_1^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)|$$
$$\leq 2^{k_2'-k'_{2,+}/2} + 2^{k_2+2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}} \lesssim 2^{k_2'-k'_{2,+}/2}.$$

Hence, we can take advantage of this fact by doing integration by parts in time again. As a result, we have

$$J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l;k_1',k_2'} = \sum_{i=1,2}(-1)^i\mathrm{E}_i+\mathrm{H}_1, \quad \mathrm{E}_i = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it_i\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}\widetilde{m}^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1}}(t_i,\xi-\eta)$$
$$\times\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1'}}(t_i,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\kappa}_{k_2'}}(t_i,\sigma)d\eta d\sigma, \quad \mathrm{H}_1 = -\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}$$
$$\times\,\widetilde{m}^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))\partial_t\big(\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_2}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1'}}(t,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\kappa}_{k_2'}}(t,\sigma)\big)d\eta d\sigma dt, \tag{7.25}$$

where

$$\widetilde{m}^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)=\frac{m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}{i\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa}_{1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}=\frac{q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)}{-\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\frac{(q_{\nu\tau,\nu\kappa}(\eta-\sigma,\sigma))^{\nu}}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa}_{1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}$$
$$=\frac{q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)}{-\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\frac{(q_{\tau\nu,\kappa\nu}(\eta-\sigma,\sigma))^{\nu}}{\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa}_{1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)}\psi_0(2^{-\kappa_1}\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta))\psi_0(2^{-\kappa_2}\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa}_{1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)),$$
$$\kappa_1=k_2+2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\},\kappa_2=k_2'-k_{2,+}'/2.$$

Here, we only do the endpoint case in details, as H_1 term can be dealt with very similarly. Using the inverse Fourier transform twice, we have

$$\mathrm{E}_i=\frac{1}{16\pi^4}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}2^{-\kappa_2-\kappa_1}\widehat{\chi}(\lambda_2)\widehat{\chi}(\lambda_1)e^{i(t_i+2^{-\kappa_2}\lambda_2)\Phi^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa}_{1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)+i2^{-\kappa_1}\lambda_1\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))$$
$$\times q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\big(q_{\tau\nu,\kappa\nu}(\eta-\sigma,\sigma)\big)^{\nu}\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1}}(t_i,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1'}}(t_i,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\kappa}_{k_2'}}(t_i,\sigma)d\eta d\sigma d\lambda_2 d\lambda_1$$
$$=\frac{1}{16\pi^4}2^{-\kappa_1-\kappa_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\widehat{\chi}(\lambda_1)\widehat{\chi}(\chi_2)e^{i(t_i+2^{-\kappa_2}\lambda_2+2^{-\kappa_1}\lambda_1)\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)+i\nu(t_i+2^{-\kappa_2}\lambda_2)\Lambda(\eta)}\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))$$
$$q_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1}}(\xi-\eta)T^{\tau,\kappa}_{\lambda_2}(f_{k_1'},f_{k_2'})(\eta)d\eta d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2,$$

where

$$\widehat{\chi}(\lambda)=\int e^{-i\lambda x}\frac{\psi_0(x)}{x}dx,$$
$$T^{\tau,\kappa}_{\lambda_2}(f_{k_1'},f_{k_2'})(\eta)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}e^{-i(t_i+2^{-\kappa_2}\lambda_2)(\tau\Lambda(|\eta-\sigma|)+\kappa\Lambda(|\sigma|))}(q_{\tau\nu,\kappa\nu}(\eta-\sigma,\sigma))^{\nu}\widehat{f^{\tau}_{k_1'}}(t_i,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\kappa}_{k_2'}}(t_i,\sigma)d\sigma.$$

Using the rapidly decay property of $\widehat{\chi}(\lambda)$, very similar to the proof of (3.20) in Lemma 3.6, we can derive the following estimate,

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{E}_i]\|_{B_{k,j}}\lesssim\sup_{|\lambda_1|,|\lambda_2|\leq 2^{\beta m/10}}2^{\alpha k+6k_++j+k_1-\kappa_1-\kappa_2}2^{(k_1-k_2)/2}\|e^{i(t_i+2^{-\kappa_1}\lambda_1+2^{-\kappa_2}\lambda_2)\Lambda}f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty}$$
$$\times\|T^{\tau,\kappa}_{\lambda_2}(f_{k_1'},f_{k_2'})(\eta)\|_{L^2}+2^{-10m+k_1+k_2-\kappa_1-\kappa_2+2k_2+2k_2'}\|\widehat{f_{k_1}}\|_{L^\infty_\xi}\|\widehat{f_{k_1'}}\|_{L^\infty_\xi}\|\widehat{f_{k_2'}}\|_{L^\infty_\xi}$$
$$\lesssim\sup_{|\lambda_1|,|\lambda_2|\leq 2^{\beta m/10}}2^{-3k_2/2+k_1/2-k_2'+k_2+12\beta m}\|e^{i(t_i+2^{-\kappa_2\lambda_2})\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}+2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-m-(1+2\alpha)k_2/2+k_1/2+13\beta m}\epsilon_0+2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0\lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.26}$$

In above estimate, we used the fact that $k_2\geq -m/(2-2\alpha)-12\beta m$ and also used (5.20) in Lemma 5.4 and (3.11) in Lemma 3.3.

The estimate of H_1 can be done very similarly. Following the same argument, (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, and (5.21) in Lemma 5.4, we can prove the following estimate if $k_2\leq -10\beta m$

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{H}_1]\|_{Z}\lesssim\sup_{|\lambda_1|,|\lambda_2|\leq 2^{\beta m/10}}\big[2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j+k_1-\kappa_1-\kappa_2}2^{(k_1-k_2)/2}\|e^{i(t_i+2^{-\kappa_1}\lambda_1+2^{-\kappa_2}\lambda_2)\Lambda}f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty}$$
$$\times\big(\|T^{\tau,\kappa}_{\lambda_2}(\partial_t f_{k_1'},f_{k_2'})(\eta)\|_{L^2}+\|T^{\tau,\kappa}_{\lambda_2}(f_{k_1'},\partial_t f_{k_2'})(\eta)\|_{L^2}\big)+2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j+k_1-\kappa_1-\kappa_2+k_2+l/2}\|\partial_t f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\times$$
$$\|T^{\tau,\kappa}_{\lambda_2}(f_{k_1'},f_{k_2'})(\eta)\|_{L^2}\big]+2^{-10m+k_1+k_2-\kappa_1-\kappa_2+k_2+k_2'}\big(\|\partial_t f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}$$
$$+\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|\partial_t f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}+\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}\|\partial_t f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}\big)$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-(1+2\alpha)k_2/2+k_1/2-m+13\beta m}\epsilon_0+2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0+2^{(1-\alpha)k_2+k_1/2+8\beta m}\epsilon_0\lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.27}$$

If $k_2 \geq -10\beta m$, then instead of using the inverse Fourier transform twice, we use the $L^2 - L^\infty - L^\infty$ type trilinear estimate directly. From Lemma 3.2, (3.3) in Lemma 3.1, (4.16) and (4.18) in Lemma 4.2, and (5.21) in Lemma 5.4, the following estimate holds,

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\mathrm{H}_1]\|_Z \lesssim 2^{\alpha k + 6k_+ + m + j - 20k_2}\big(\|\partial_t f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_2'}\|_{L^\infty}$$
$$+\|\partial_t f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty}\|e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_2'}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_t f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty}\big)$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-m-22k_2+7\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m - \delta j}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.28}$$

Case 3: If $k_2' - 3\beta m \geq k_2$ and $(k_1', k_2', \nu\tau, \nu\kappa) \in \mathcal{P}_{bad}^{k_2}$. For this case, we first localize the angle between η and $\nu\kappa\sigma$ and then decompose $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l;k_1',k_2'}$ as follows,

$$J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l;k_1',k_2'} = \sum_{j_1 \geq -k_{1,-}, j_2 \geq -k_{2,-}} \sum_{j_1' \geq -k_{1,-}', j_2' \geq -k_{2,-}'} \sum_{\bar{\tilde{l}} \leq \tilde{l} \leq 2} H^{j_1,j_2}_{l,\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'} \tag{7.29}$$

$$H^{j_1,j_2}_{l,\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'} := \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{it\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi,\eta)\widehat{f^{\mu}_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)Q_{k_2,j_2}\widehat{[T^{\nu\tau,\nu\kappa}_{\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'}(t)]}^{\nu}(\eta)d\eta dt, \tag{7.30}$$

where $\bar{\tilde{l}} = \max\{l - 6\beta m/5, 2k_{1,-}'\}$ and

$$T^{\nu\tau,\nu\kappa}_{\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'}(t) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\big[\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{it\Phi^{\tau,\kappa}(\eta,\sigma)}\widehat{f^{\nu\tau}_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^{\nu\kappa}_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma)q_{\nu\tau,\nu\kappa}(\eta-\sigma,\sigma)\varphi_{\bar{\tilde{l}};\tilde{l}}(\angle(\eta,\nu\kappa\sigma))d\sigma\big].$$

For simplicity, we also use the following notation,

$$H_{l,\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'} := \sum_{j_1 \geq -k_{1,-}, j_2 \geq -k_{2,-},} H^{j_1,j_2}_{l,\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'},$$
$$H^{j_1,j_2}_{l,\tilde{l}} = \sum_{j_1' \geq -k_{1,-}', j_2' \geq -k_{2,-}'} H^{j_1,j_2}_{l,\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'}, \quad T^{\nu\tau,\nu\kappa}_{\tilde{l}}(t) = \sum_{j_1' \geq -k_{1,-}', j_2' \geq -k_{2,-}'} T^{\nu\tau,\nu\kappa}_{\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'}(t).$$

- If either $2k_{1,-}' \geq l - 6\beta m/5$ or $2k_{1,-}' < l - 6\beta m/5$, $\tilde{l} > \bar{\tilde{l}} = l - 6\beta m/5$, we have $k_2 + 2\tilde{l} \geq k_2 + 2l - 12\beta m/5 \geq -m + 8\beta m/5$ and $l - \tilde{l} \leq 6\beta m/5$. Recall that $k_2 \leq k_2' - 3\beta m$, i.e., $|\eta| \ll |\sigma|$. Hence, we can do integration by parts in "σ" many times to rule out the case when $\max\{j_1', j_2'\} \leq m + k_2 - k_2' + \tilde{l} - 2\beta m$. From (3.20) in Lemma 3.6 and (3.17) in Lemma 3.5, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1',j_2'\} \geq m + k_2 - k_2' + \tilde{l} - 2\beta m} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[H_{l,\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1',j_2'\} \geq m + k_2 - k_2' + \tilde{l} - 2\beta m} \sup_{|\lambda| \leq 2^{\beta m}} 2^{\alpha k + 6k_+ + m + j}$$
$$\times 2^{k_1 - k_2 - 2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}} 2^{(k_1-k_2)/2}\|e^{-i(t + 2^{-k_2 - 2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}\lambda)} f_{k_1}(t)\|_{L^\infty} 2^{k_2 - m - \max\{j_1',j_2'\} - 2\alpha k_2'}\|f_{k_1',j_1'}\|_Z$$
$$\times\|f_{k_2',j_2'}\|_Z + 2^{-10m + k + \alpha k + m + j + k_1 - k_2 - 2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\} + k_2}\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{-m - \max\{j_1',j_2'\} - 2\alpha k_2'}\|f_{k_1',j_1'}\|_Z\|f_{k_2',j_2'}\|_Z$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-3k_2/2 - k_1/2 + k_2' + 10\beta m - m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-m/10 + 11\beta m - k_1/2}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-\alpha m/2 - k_1/2}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.31}$$

From (3.15) and (3.17) in Lemma 3.5, the following estimate also holds,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1',j_2'\} \geq k_2 - k_2' + \tilde{l} - 2\beta m} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[H_{l,\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1',j_2'\} \geq k_2 - k_2' + \tilde{l} - 2\beta m} 2^{\alpha k + 6k_+ + m + j + k_1 - k_2 - 2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}$$
$$\times 2^{k_1 + k_2 + l}\|\widehat{f_{k_1}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} 2^{k_2 - m - \max\{j_1',j_2'\} - 2\alpha k_2'}\|f_{k_1',j_1'}\|_Z\|f_{k_2',j_2'}\|_Z \lesssim 2^{k_1 + 10\beta m}\epsilon_0. \tag{7.32}$$

Therefore, combining estimates (7.31) and (7.32), we can derive the following estimates,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1',j_2'\}\geq k_2-k_2'+\tilde{l}-2\beta m} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[H_{l,\tilde{l};j_1',j_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim \big(2^{-\alpha m/2-k_1/2}\epsilon_0\big)^{1/2}\big(2^{k_1+10\beta m}\epsilon_0\big)^{1/2} \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

- If $2k_{1,-}' < l-6\beta m/5$ and $\tilde{l}=\bar{\tilde{l}}=l-6\beta m/5$, then we have $k_2'\leq -3\beta m/5$ and $k_2\leq -18\beta m/5$. The estimate of $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l;k_1',k_2'}$ is exactly same as the estimate of the previous endpoint case. We view the bilinear term $T^{\nu\tau,\nu\kappa}_{\tilde{l}}(t)$ as a input of a bilinear operator. As in the endpoint case, whether $j_1\leq j_2$ makes a difference.

(i) If $j_2\leq j_1$. Then we can first rule out the case when $j_1\leq m+l-\beta m$ by doing integration by parts in "η" many times for (7.30). It remains to consider the case when $j_1\geq m+l-\beta m$. From (3.15) and (3.17) in Lemma 3.5, the following estimate holds,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sum_{j_2\leq j_1, m+l-\beta m\leq j_1} \mathcal{F}^{-1}[H^{j_1,j_2}_{l,\tilde{l}}]\|_Z &\lesssim \sum_{m+l-\beta m\leq j_1} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+k_{1,-}+3k_{1,+}/2-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+k_2+l/2}\\ \times\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^2}\|T^{\nu\tau,\nu\kappa}_{\tilde{l}}(t)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sum_{j_1\geq m+l-\beta m} 2^{-k_{1,-}/2+3k_{1,+}/2+2m+l+100\delta m-j_1}\|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z\\ \times 2^{k_2}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^{k_2/2+(1-2\alpha)k_2'+\beta m+100\delta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.\end{aligned}$$

(ii) If $j_2\geq j_1$. For this case, we can rule out the case when $j_2\leq m+l-\beta m$ by doing integration by parts in "η" many times for (7.30). Therefore, it remains to consider the case when $j_2\geq m+l-\beta m$. Note that $j_2\geq m+l-\beta m\geq m+\tilde{l}+\beta m/6$, $k_2+2\tilde{l}\geq k_2+2l-12\beta m/5\geq -m+8\beta m/5$, and $k_2'\geq k_2+3\beta m$, all conditions of Lemma 7.2 are satisfied. Therefore, from (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, (5.20) in Lemma 5.4, and (7.19) in Lemma 7.2, the following estimate holds,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sum_{j_1\leq j_2, m+l-\beta m\leq j_2} \mathcal{F}^{-1}[H^{j_1,j_2}_{l,\tilde{l}}]\|_Z &\lesssim \sum_{m+l-\beta m\leq j_2} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+k_{1,-}+3k_{1,+}/2-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+k_2+l/2}\\ \times\|f_{k_1}\|_{L^2}\|Q_{k_2,j_2}[\mathcal{F}^{-1}[T^{\nu\tau,\nu\kappa}_{\tilde{l}}(t)]]\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sum_{j_2\geq m+l-\beta m} 2^{m+(1-2\alpha)k_2+3l/2-j_2+200\delta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.\end{aligned}$$

Now we proceed to estimate $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l;k_1',k_2'}$. Note that, for $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l;k_1',k_2'}$, $|k_1-k_1'|\leq 5$ if $k_1'\geq k_2'+5$ and $k_1\leq k_1'+5$ if $k_1'\leq k_2'+5$. Same as what we did in the estimate of $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l;k_1',k_2'}$, when $\tau=\kappa=-$, we can do integration by parts in time to take the advantage of the fact that the size of phase is big. With minor modifications in (7.26), (7.27) and (7.28), we can see our desired estimate still holds. For the case when $(\tau,\kappa)\neq(-,-)$, we divide it into four cases as follows.

Case 1: If $l\geq -2\alpha m/3$ and $k_2'+2k_1\leq -m/2-\alpha m+3\beta m$. From (4.4) in Lemma 4.1, we can see that the size of $\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)$ is $2^{k_2+2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}-k_{1,+}/2}$, hence we can put a cutoff function $\psi_0(2^{-\kappa}\Phi^{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta))$ inside the symbols $m_{\mu,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)$, $m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$, and $m^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$, with κ choose to be $2^{k_2+2\max\{k_{1,-},l\}-k_{1,+}/2}$. This fact enables us to use Lemma 3.6. From (3.21) in Lemma 3.6 and (5.20), after putting the input f_{k_2} in L^∞ and $T^{\tau,\kappa}(f_{k_1'},f_{k_2'})$ in L^2, the following estimate holds,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l;k_1',k_2'}]\|_Z &\lesssim \sup_{|\lambda|\leq 2^{\beta m}} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+k_1}\|e^{i(t+2^{-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}\lambda)}f_{k_2}(t)\|_{L^\infty}\\ &\times\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2} + 2^{-10m+k+\alpha k+m+j+k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+k_1}\|f_{k_2}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}\end{aligned} \tag{7.33}$$

$$\lesssim 2^{m+2k_1+2\beta m+k_2'-k_2-l}(2^{2k_2+\delta m})^{1/2}(2^{-m+\alpha m/3})^{1/2}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-\alpha m/6+6\beta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0$$

In above estimate, we used the following fact,

$$\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_2}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \min\{2^{-m+\alpha m/3}\epsilon_1, 2^{k_2}\|P_{k_2}f(t)\|_{L^2}\} \lesssim \min\{2^{-m+\alpha m/3}, 2^{2k_2+\delta m}\}\epsilon_1.$$

Case 2: If $l \geq -2\alpha m/3$ and $k_2'+2k_1 \geq -m/2-\alpha m+3\beta m$. For this case we have $\max\{k_1, k_1'\} \geq -m/6 - \alpha m/3 + \beta m$ and $\min\{k_1, k_2'\} + 4k_1' \geq -5m/6 - 5\alpha m/3 + 5\beta m \geq -m + 5\beta m$.

When $\tau\kappa = -$, from (4.26) in Lemma 4.3, we can do integration by parts in σ many times to rule out the case $\max\{j_1', j_2'\} \leq m + k_1' + k_1 - 4\beta m$.

Recall that the case when $\tau = \kappa = -$ is ruled out. For the case when $\tau\kappa = +$, i.e., $\tau = \kappa = +$, we do integration by parts in σ when $\angle(\xi - \sigma, \sigma - \eta) \geq 2^{-\alpha m}$. The net gain of doing integration by parts in "σ " once is at least $\max\{2^{-m+\alpha m-\max\{j_1',j_2'\}+2\beta m}, 2^{-m-k_1+2\alpha m+2\beta m}\}$, which is less than $2^{-\beta m}$ when $\max\{j_1', j_2'\} \leq m - 2\alpha m$. When $\angle(\xi - \sigma, \sigma - \eta) \leq 2^{-\alpha m}$, then we have $\angle(\xi - \eta, \sigma - \eta) \leq 2^{-\alpha m}$ and $\angle(\sigma - \eta, \nu\eta) \sim \angle(\xi - \eta, \nu\eta) \sim 2^l \gtrsim 2^{-2\alpha m/3}$. For this case, we do integration by parts in "η". The net gain of doing integration by parts in "η" once is at least $\max\{2^{-m-l-\max\{j_2,j_2'\}+4\beta m}, 2^{-m-k_2-2l+2\beta m}\}$, which is less than $2^{-\beta m}$ when $\max\{j_2, j_2'\} \leq m - 2\alpha m$.

Therefore, in whichever case, we can rule out the case when $\max\{j_2, j_1', j_2'\} \leq \min\{m + k_1 + k_1' - 4\beta m, m - 2\alpha m\}$. It is sufficient to consider the case when $\max\{j_2, j_1', j_2'\} \geq \min\{m + k_1 + k_1' - 4\beta m, m - 2\alpha m\} \geq m + k_1 + k_1' - 4\beta m - 2\alpha m$. From (3.21) in Lemma 3.6, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_2,j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_1+k_1'-4\beta m-2\alpha m} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[H^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l,j_2;j_1',j_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_2,j_1',j_2'\}\geq m+k_1+k_1'-4\beta m-2\alpha m} 2^{\alpha k+6k_++m+j}$$
$$\times 2^{k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}2^{-m-\alpha k_2}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_Z 2^{k_1-m-\max\{j_2,j_1',j_2'\}-\alpha k_1'-\alpha k_2'}\|f_{k_1',j_1'}\|_Z\|f_{k_2',j_2'}\|_Z$$
$$+2^{-10m+k+\alpha k+m+j+k_1-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}}\|f_{k_2,j_2}\|_Z 2^{k_1-m-\max\{j_2,j_1',j_2'\}-\alpha k_1'-\alpha k_2'}\|f_{k_1',j_1'}\|_Z\|f_{k_2',j_2'}\|_Z$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-(1+\alpha)k_2-l+2\alpha m-\alpha k_2'+4\beta m-m} \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

Case 3: If $l \leq -2\alpha m/3$ and $k_2' + 2k_1 \leq k_2 + 2\max\{l, k_{1,-}\} + \beta m$. From (3.21) in Lemma 3.6 and (5.20), estimate (7.33) also holds and

$$(7.33) \lesssim 2^{l+2k_1+k_2'-k_2-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+\alpha m/3+8\beta m}\epsilon_0 + 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-2\alpha m/3+\alpha m/3+9\beta m}\epsilon_0 + 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

Case 4: If $l \leq -2\alpha m/3$ and $k_2' + 2k_1 \geq k_2 + 2\max\{l, k_{1,-}\} + \beta m$. For this case, we have $k_1 \leq l/2 \leq -\alpha m/3$ and $k_2' \geq k_2$. Note that,

$$|\Phi_2^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi, \eta, \sigma)| \gtrsim 2^{k_2'+2k_1} - 2^{k_2+2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}} \gtrsim 2^{k_2'+2k_1}. \tag{7.34}$$

With this observation, it motives us to do integration by parts in time again and have a similar identity as in (7.25) for $J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l;k_1',k_2'}$. The main difference is that now $\kappa_1 = k_2 + 2\max\{l, k_{1,-}\}$ and $\kappa_2 \geq k_2' + 2k_1$ in the case we are considering.

After using the inverse Fourier transform twice, we can derive the following estimate by using (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, (5.20), (5.21) and (5.22) in Lemma 5.4,

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[J^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l;k_1',k_2'}]\|_Z \lesssim \sum_{\kappa_2\geq k_2'+2k_1} \sup_{|\lambda_1|,|\lambda_2|\leq 2^{\beta m/10}} \sum_{i=1,2} 2^{\alpha k+j+2k_1-\kappa_1-\kappa_2+k_2+l/2}\|f_{k_2}(t_i)\|_{L^2}$$
$$\times\|e^{-i(t_i+2^{-\kappa_2}\lambda_2)\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2} + 2^{\alpha k+m+j+2k_1-\kappa_1-\kappa_2+k_2+l/2}$$

$$\times\big(\|\partial_t f_{k_2}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-i(t_i+2^{-\kappa_2}\lambda_2)\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}+\|f_{k_2}\|_{L^2}\|e^{-i(t_i+2^{-\kappa_2}\lambda_2)\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|\partial_t f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}\big)$$
$$+2^{\alpha k+m+j+2k_1-\kappa_1-\kappa_2+2k_2+l}\|\widehat{f_{k_2}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi}\|e^{-i(t_i+2^{-\kappa_2}\lambda_2)\Lambda}f_{k_2'}\|_{L^\infty}\|\partial_t f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}$$
$$+2^{-10m-\kappa_1-\kappa_2}\big(\|f_{k_2}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}+\|f_{k_2}\|_{L^2}\|\partial_t f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}$$
$$+\|\partial_t f_{k_2}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}+\|f_{k_2}\|_{L^2}\|f_{k_1'}\|_{L^2}\|\partial_t f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}\big)$$
$$\lesssim 2^{k_2-\alpha k_2'-\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}/2+\beta m}\epsilon_0+2^{k_2+k_1'+2l-k_2'-2\max\{l,k_{1,-}\}+\beta m+\alpha m/3}\epsilon_0+2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0$$
$$\lesssim 2^{(1-2\alpha)k_2/2+2\beta m}\epsilon_0+2^{l+\alpha m/3+2\beta m}\epsilon_0+2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0\lesssim 2^{-2\delta m-\delta j}\epsilon_0.$$

Note that we used the fact that $k_2\le k_2'$, $l\le -2\alpha m/3$ and $k_2\le k_1\le -\alpha m/3$.

7.3. **Estimate of** $K^{\tau,\kappa}(\cdot,\cdot)$ **in bad**$_k$**.** In this subsection, we mainly study the case when $(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^3$. The main difference between this case and what we studied before (where $(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^1\cup\chi_k^2$) is that both $\nabla_\eta\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ $(\nabla_\eta\Phi_2^{\tau,\tau,\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma))$ and $\nabla_\sigma\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)(\nabla_\sigma\Phi_2^{\tau,\tau,\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma))$ can be zero at the same time. To get around difficulty, we need to utilize different properties of phase near the space resonance set in “ η” and “σ”. Following the same argument as we did in subsection 6.1, we restrict ourself to the case when $-m+\alpha m/3\le k\le\beta m$ and $j\le m+20\delta m$.

As we need to gain some smallness from the angle when the phase is highly degenerated, it is crucial to classify phases first. Note that, phases of the following types are not highly degenerated

$$\Phi^{-,-}(\xi,\eta)\sim 2^{k-k_+/2},\quad \Phi^{-,+}(\xi,\eta)\sim 2^{k-k_+/2}.\tag{7.35}$$

Note that the linear part of $\Phi^{+,-}(\xi,\eta)$ only vanishes when $\angle(\xi,-\eta)=0$ and the linear part of $\Phi^{+,+}(\xi,\eta)$ only vanishes when $\angle(\xi,\eta)=\angle(\xi,\xi-\eta)=0$. Hence, the following estimate holds,

$$\Phi^{+,-}(\xi,\eta)\psi_{\ge-10}(\angle(\xi,-\eta))+\Phi^{+,+}(\xi,\eta)\big(1-\psi_{\le-10}(\angle(\xi,\xi-\eta))\psi_{\le-5}(\angle(\xi,-\eta))\big)\sim 2^{k-k_+/2}.\tag{7.36}$$

Therefore, we can decompose $A_{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $K^{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$ into two parts as follows,

$$A_{+,\nu}(u(t),u^\nu(t)):=\sum_{i=1,2}A^i_{+,\nu}(u(t),u^\nu(t)),\quad K^{+,\nu}(f_{k_1},f^\nu_{k_2})=\sum_{i=1,2}K_i^{+,\nu}(f_{k_1},f^\nu_{k_2}),\tag{7.37}$$

where symbols $m^i_{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$ of $A^i_{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$, $\nu\in\{+,-\},i\in\{1,2\}$, are defined as follows,

$$m^1_{+,-}(\xi-\eta,\eta)=m_{+,-}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\psi_{\ge-10}(\angle(\xi,-\eta),\quad m^2_{+,-}(\xi-\eta,\eta)=m_{+,-}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\psi_{<-10}(\angle(\xi,-\eta),$$
$$m^1_{+,+}(\xi-\eta,\eta)=m_{+,+}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\big(1-\psi_{\le-10}(\angle(\xi,\xi-\eta))\psi_{\le-5}(\angle(\xi,-\eta))\big),$$
$$m^2_{+,+}(\xi-\eta,\eta)=m_{+,+}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\psi_{\le-10}(\angle(\xi,\xi-\eta))\psi_{\le-5}(\angle(\xi,-\eta)),$$

and

$$K_i^{+,\nu}(f^\mu_{k_1},f^\nu_{k_2})=-\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int e^{it\Phi^{+,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}m^i_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\partial_t\big(\widehat{f_{k_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^\nu_{k_2}}(t,\eta)\big)d\eta dt,\quad i\in\{1,2\}.$$

The angle $\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)$ inside $K_2^{+,\nu}(f_{k_1},f^\nu_{k_2})$ is very crucial. We localize the angle and do decomposition as follows,

$$K_2^{+,\nu}(f_{k_1},f^\nu_{k_2})=\sum_{\bar l\le l\le 2}K^{+,\nu}_{2,l}(f_{k_1},f^\nu_{k_2}),\quad \nu\in\{+,-\},\quad \bar l:=2k_-,$$

$$K^{+,\nu}_{2,l}(f_{k_1},f^\nu_{k_2})=-\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int e^{it\Phi^{+,\nu}(\xi,\eta)}m^2_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\partial_t\big(\widehat{f^\mu_{k_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^\nu_{k_2}}(t,\eta)\big)\varphi_{\bar l;l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))d\eta dt.$$

From above estimates, (5.3), Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\sum_{\nu\in\{+,-\}} \|m_{-,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} + \|m^1_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} \lesssim 2^{2k_+}. \tag{7.38}$$

As the angle is well localized for $K_2^{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$, we can do better for j. After doing integration by parts in "ξ" many times, we can rule out the case when $j \geq \max\{m+l,-k-l\}+100\delta m$. It is sufficient to consider the case when $j \leq \max\{m+l,-k-l\}+100\delta m$.

Recall (5.15), after plug-in the equation satisfied by $\partial_t f$ in (5.1), we have essentially same formulas as in (6.13) and (7.10) for $K^{-,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$, $K_1^{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$, and $K_2^{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$. For reader's convenience, we state them in details as follows,

$$K^{-,\nu}(\bar{f}_{k_1}, f^\nu_{k_2}) = \sum_{(k_1',j_1'),(k_2',j_2')\in\mathcal{J}} \sum_{\tau,\kappa\in\{+,-\}} \Big(\sum_{j_1\geq -k_{1,-}} K^{-,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'} + \sum_{j_2\geq -k_{2,-}} K^{-,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{j_2;j_1',j_2'}\Big) + \mathrm{JR}^{-,\nu}_{k_1,k_2},$$

$$K_1^{+,\nu}(f_{k_1}, f^\nu_{k_2}) = \sum_{(k_1',j_1'),(k_2',j_2')\in\mathcal{J}} \sum_{\tau,\kappa\in\{+,-\}} \Big(\sum_{j_1\geq -k_{1,-}} K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'} + \sum_{j_2\geq -k_{2,-}} K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{j_2;j_1',j_2'}\Big) + \mathrm{JR}^{+,\nu}_{k_1,k_2;1},$$

$$K_{2,l}^{+,\nu}(f_{k_1}, f^\nu_{k_2}) = \sum_{(k_1',j_1'),(k_2',j_2')\in\mathcal{J}} \sum_{\tau,\kappa\in\{+,-\}} \Big(\sum_{j_1\geq -k_{1,-}} K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l,j_1;j_1',j_2'} + \sum_{j_2\geq -k_{2,-}} K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l,j_2;j_1',j_2'}\Big) + \mathrm{JR}^{+,\nu}_{k_1,k_2;2},$$

where

$$K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'} = -\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)} c^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\widehat{f^\mu_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^\tau_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^\kappa_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma)\,d\eta d\sigma dt,$$

$$K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{j_2;j_1',j_2'} = -\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi_2^{\tau,\kappa,\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)} c^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\widehat{f^\tau_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\xi-\sigma)\widehat{f^\kappa_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma-\eta)\widehat{f^\nu_{k_2,j_2}}(t,\eta)\,d\eta d\sigma dt,$$

$$K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l,j_1;j_1',j_2'} = -\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi_1^{+,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)} c^{\tau,\kappa}_{+,\nu,l,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\widehat{f^\mu_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^\tau_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\eta-\sigma)\widehat{f^\kappa_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma)\,d\eta d\sigma dt,$$

$$K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l,j_2;j_1',j_2'} = -\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi_2^{\tau,\kappa,\nu}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)} c^{\tau,\kappa}_{+,\nu,l,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\widehat{f^\tau_{k_1',j_1'}}(t,\xi-\sigma)\widehat{f^\kappa_{k_2',j_2'}}(t,\sigma-\eta)\widehat{f^\nu_{k_2,j_2}}(t,\eta)\,d\eta d\sigma dt,$$

$$\mathrm{JR}^{-,\nu}_{k_1,k_2} = -\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int e^{it\Phi^{-,\nu}(\xi,\eta)} m_{-,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\big(\widehat{\overline{\mathcal{R}'}}_{k_1}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^\nu_{k_2}}(t,\eta) + \widehat{\bar{f}}_{k_1}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{\mathcal{R}'^\nu_{k_2}}(t,\eta)\big)\,d\eta dt,$$

$$\mathrm{JR}^{+,\nu}_{k_1,k_2;i} = -\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int e^{it\Phi^{+,\nu}(\xi,\eta)} d^i_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\big(\widehat{\mathcal{R}'}_{k_1}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^\nu_{k_2}}(t,\eta) + \widehat{f_{k_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{\mathcal{R}'^\nu_{k_2}}(t,\eta)\big)\,d\eta dt,$$

where the explicit formulas of all symbols appeared above are given as follows,

$$d^1_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta) = m^1_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta), \quad d^2_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta) = m^2_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)),$$

$$c^{\tau,\kappa}_{-,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) := m_{-,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\big(q_{\tau\nu,\kappa\nu}(\eta-\sigma,\sigma)\big)^\nu\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta),$$

$$c^{\tau,\kappa}_{+,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) := m^1_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\big(q_{\tau\nu,\kappa\nu}(\eta-\sigma,\sigma)\big)^\nu\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta),$$

$$c^{\tau,\kappa}_{-,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) := m_{-,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\overline{q_{-\tau,-\kappa}(\xi-\sigma,\sigma-\eta)}\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta),$$

$$c^{\tau,\kappa}_{+,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) := m^1_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)q_{\tau,\kappa}(\xi-\sigma,\sigma-\eta)\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta),$$

$$c^{\tau,\kappa}_{+,\nu,l,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) := m^2_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\big(q_{\tau\nu,\kappa\nu}(\eta-\sigma,\sigma)\big)^\nu\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)),$$

$$c^{\tau,\kappa}_{+,\nu,l,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma) := m^2_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)q_{\tau,\kappa}(\xi-\sigma,\sigma-\eta)\psi_k(\xi)\psi_{k_1}(\xi-\eta)\psi_{k_2}(\eta)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta)).$$

7.3.1. *The Z-norm estimate of $K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'}$ and $K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,i}_{l,j_1;j_1',j_2'}$, $i\in\{1,2\}$.* As η and $\xi-\eta$ now are comparable, there is little difference to estimate $K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'}$ ($K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l,j_1;j_1',j_2'}$) and $K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'}$ ($K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,2}_{l,j_1;j_1',j_2'}$). For simplicity, we only estimate $K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'}$ and $K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l,j_1;j_1',j_2'}$ in details here.

If either $(k_1',k_2')\in\chi^1_{k_2}\cup\chi^2_{k_2}$ or $(k_1',k_2')\in\chi^3_{k_2}, \tau\kappa=-$, from estimates in Lemma 4.1 and (4.26) in Lemma 4.3, we still have a good lower bound for $\nabla_\sigma\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\kappa}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$. Therefore, the methods we used in the good type phases and the bad type phases can still be used to estimate those scenarios. Therefore, we restrict ourself to the case when $(k_1',k_2')\in\chi^3_{k_2}$ and $\tau\kappa=+$.

From L^2-L^∞ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1, (7.38), and (3.11) in Lemma 3.3, the following estimate holds when $k\le-\beta m/100$,

$$\sum_{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa\in\{+,-\}}\|\sum_{j_1\ge-k_{1,-},j_1'\ge-k_{1,-},j_2'\ge-k_{2,-}'} K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'}\|_{B_{k,j}}$$

$$\lesssim\sup_{t\in[t_1,t_2]}2^{\alpha k+m+j+k}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty}\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2}\|_{L^2}\lesssim 2^{(2-\alpha)k+100\delta m}\epsilon_0\lesssim 2^{-4\delta m}\epsilon_0. \quad (7.39)$$

From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5 and (5.21) in Lemma 5.4 , the following estimate holds if $3k\le-m+\beta m$,

$$\sum_{\nu\in\{+,-\}}\|\sum_{j_1\ge-k_{1,-},j_1'\ge-k_{1,-},j_2'\ge-k_{2,-}'} K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l,j_1;j_1',j_2'}\|_{B_{k,j}}\lesssim\sup_{t\in[t_1,t_2]}2^{\alpha k+m+j}2^{-2\max\{k,l\}}2^{2k+l}2^k\|\widehat{f}_{k_2}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi}$$

$$\times\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_1'}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2'}\|_{L^2}\lesssim 2^{200\delta m}\max\{2^{m+l+4k},2^{m+4k},2^k\}\epsilon_0\lesssim 2^{-10\delta m}\epsilon_0. \quad (7.40)$$

If $-m+\beta m\le 3k\le-3\beta m/100$, then $|\Phi^{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)|$ is greater than $2^{-m+\beta m}$. This fact enables us to use the estimate (3.21) in Lemma 3.6. Together with (3.15) in Lemma 3.5, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{\nu\in\{+,-\}}\|K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l,j_1;j_1',j_2'}\|_{B_{k,j}}\lesssim 2^{\alpha k+m+j-2\max\{k,l\}}\min\{2^{-m-\alpha k}2^{-m+(2-\alpha)k},2^{2k+l+10\delta m}2^{-m+(2-\alpha)k}\}\epsilon_0$$

$$\lesssim\max\{2^{(1-\alpha)k+200\delta m},2^{k+200\delta m}\}\epsilon_0\lesssim 2^{(1-\alpha)k+200\delta m}\epsilon_0\lesssim 2^{-2\delta m}. \quad (7.41)$$

To sum up, we only need to consider the case when $-\beta m/100\le k\le\beta m$, $(k_1',k_2')\in\chi^3_k$. As now k is almost like "1", the angle "l", which is greater than $2k_-$, plays little role. there is little difference of estimating $K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{l,j_1;j_1',j_2'}$ and $K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'}$. We only consider $K^{+,\nu,\tau,\kappa,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'}$ in details here.

From $L^2-L^\infty-L^\infty$ type estimate, after putting the input with the maximum spatial concentration in L^2 and the other two inputs in L^∞, we can rule out the case when $\max\{j_1,j_1',j_2'\}\ge\beta m$. It remains to consider the case when $\max\{j_1,j_1',j_2'\}\le\beta m$.

We decompose $K^{\mu,\nu,\tau,\tau,1}_{j_1;j_1',j_2'}$ into three parts: (i) the region that is away from the space resonance set in "σ"; (ii) the region that is away from the space resonance set in "η"; (iii) the region that is close to the space resonance sets in "σ" and in "η". More precisely, we decompose the symbol $c^{\tau,\kappa}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ into three pieces as follows,

$$c^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)=\sum_{i=1,2,3}e^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,i}(\xi,\eta,\sigma), e^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)=c^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\psi_{\ge\tilde{l}_{\mu,\tau}}(\sigma-\eta/2),$$

$$e^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,2}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)=c^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\psi_{\ge\tilde{l}_{\mu,\tau}}\big((\xi-\eta)-\mu\tau(\eta-\sigma)\big)\psi_{<\tilde{l}_{\mu,\tau}}(\sigma-\eta/2),$$

$$e^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,3}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)=c^{\tau,\tau}_{\mu,\nu,1}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\psi_{<\tilde{l}_{\mu,\tau}}\big((\xi-\eta)-\mu\tau(\eta-\sigma)\big)\psi_{<\tilde{l}_{\mu,\tau}}(\sigma-\eta/2),$$

$$\tilde{l}_{+,-}=\tilde{l}_{+,+}=\tilde{l}_{-,-}=-2\beta m,\quad \tilde{l}_{-,+}=-m/2+10\beta m.$$

As long as the threshold $\tilde{l}_{\mu,\nu}$ we choose is greater than $-m/2+5\beta m$, then we can safely do integration by parts in "σ" in region (i) and do integration by parts in "η" in region (ii) to rule out the case when $\max\{j_1, j_1', j_2'\} \leq \beta m$. We mention that the threshold we chose for $\tilde{l}_{-,+}$ is different because the strategy we use to control the region (iii) is different.

A very important observation for $\Phi_1^{+,+,+}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$, $\Phi_1^{-,-,-}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$, and $\Phi_1^{+,-,-}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ is that the sizes of phases are very big, which are greater than $2^{-\beta m/10}$, inside the region (iii). We can take advantage of this fact by doing integration by parts in time again to gain extra 2^{-m}, which is sufficient to close the argument. More precisely, the following estimate holds,

$$|\Phi_1^{\mu,\tau,\tau}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)|\psi_{<\tilde{l}_{\mu,\tau}}\big((\xi-\eta)-\mu\tau(\eta-\sigma)\big)\psi_{<\tilde{l}_{\mu,\tau}}(\sigma-\eta/2) \gtrsim 2^{-\beta m/10}, \quad (\mu,\tau,\tau)\neq(-,+,+). \tag{7.42}$$

For example, when $(\mu,\tau,\tau)=(+,+,+)$, we know that σ is very close (in a neighborhood of radius $2^{-\beta m}$) to $\eta/2$ and ξ is very close to $3\eta/2$ (in a neighborhood of radius $2^{-\beta m}$). Hence $\Phi_1^{+,+,+}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ is very close (in a neighborhood of radius $2^{-\beta m}$) to $\Phi_1^{+,+,+}(3\eta/2,\eta,\eta/2)$, which is greater than $2^{-\beta m/10}$. Therefore (7.42) holds.

Unfortunately, the good lower bound doesn't hold for $\Phi_1^{-,+,+}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$. As $\Phi_1^{-,+,+}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)$ is also very close (in a neighborhood of radius $2^{-\beta m}$) to $\Phi_1^{-,+,+}(\eta/2,\eta,\eta/2)$, which equals to "0". However, the spatial concentration "j" of output can be improved. Another very important observation is that

$$\nabla_\xi\Phi_1^{-,+,+}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)\big|_{(\eta/2,\eta,\eta/2)} = \Lambda'(|\xi|)\frac{\xi}{|\xi|} + \Lambda'(|\xi-\eta|)\frac{\xi-\eta}{|\xi-\eta|}\big|_{(\eta/2,\eta,\eta/2)} = 0.$$

Therefore, the following estimate holds,

$$|\nabla_\xi\Phi_1^{-,+,+}(\xi,\eta,\sigma)|\psi_{<\tilde{l}_{-,+}}\big((\xi-\sigma)\big)\psi_{<\tilde{l}_{-,+}}(\sigma-\eta/2) \lesssim 2^{-k_-+\beta m}\tilde{l}_{-,+} \lesssim 2^{-m/2+12\beta m}.$$

Therefore, by doing integration by parts in "ξ" many times, we can rule out the case when $j \geq m/2 + 13\beta m$. For the case when $j \leq m/2+13\beta m$, we use the size of support of η and σ for fixed ξ, which is $2^{4\tilde{l}_{-,+}}$ in total, which is less than $2^{-2m+40\beta m}$. This is sufficient to cover the loss of $2^{m+j} \leq 2^{3m/2+13\beta m}$. Therefore, close the argument.

7.3.2. *The Z-norm estimate of the reminder terms.* The estimate of $\mathrm{JR}_{k_1,k_2}^{-,\nu}$ and $\mathrm{JR}_{k_1,k_2;i}^{+,\nu}$, $i\in\{1,2\}$, is straightforward. From $L^\infty - L^2$ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1, (7.38), and (5.17) in Proposition 5.2, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{\nu\in\{+,-\}} \|\mathrm{JR}_{k_1,k_2}^{-,\nu}\|_{B_{k,j}} + \|\mathrm{JR}_{k_1,k_2;1}^{+,\nu}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{i=1,2}\sup_{t\in[t_1,t_2]} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +m+j+2k_+}\|P_{k_i}\mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}$$

$$\times\|e^{-it\Lambda}f_{k_{3-i}}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-m+10\beta m}\epsilon_0.$$

From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5 and (5.17) in Proposition 5.2, the following estimate holds if $k\leq -\beta m$,

$$\sum_{\nu\in\{+,-\}} \|\mathrm{JR}_{k_1,k_2;2}^{+,\nu}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{i=1,2}\sup_{t\in[t_1,t_2]} 2^{\alpha k+m+j-2\max\{l,k\}}2^{2k+l}\|P_{k_i}\mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}$$

$$\times\|\widehat{f}_{k_{3-i}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} \lesssim 2^{k+l+200\delta m}\epsilon_0 \lesssim 2^{-4\delta m}\epsilon_0.$$

From $L^\infty - L^2$ type bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and (5.17) in Proposition 5.2, the following estimate holds if $k \geq -\beta m$,

$$\sum_{\nu\in\{+,-\}} \|\mathrm{JR}^{+,\nu}_{k_1,k_2;2}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{i=1,2} \sup_{t\in[t_1,t_2]} 2^{m+j+50\beta m}\|P_{k_i}\mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}\|e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_{3-i}}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-\alpha m/4}\epsilon_0.$$

7.3.3. *Proof of Lemma* 5.1. Assume that $t \in [2^{m-1}, 2^m]$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $|k_1 - k|, |k_2 - k| \leq 5$.

- We first estimate $A_{-,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $A^1_{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$. By do integration by parts in "ξ" many times, we can first rule out the case when $j \geq m+5$. It remains to consider the case when $j \leq m+5$. For this case, we have

$$\sum_{\nu\in\{+,-\}} \|e^{it\Lambda} A_{-,\nu}(u^\mu(t), u^\nu(t))\|_{B_{k,j}} + \|e^{it\Lambda} A^1_{+,\nu}(u^\mu(t), u^\nu(t))\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^3} \sum_{j\leq m+5} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +j}$$

$$\times \|e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1}\|_{L^\infty}\|f_{k_2}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{(1-\alpha)k-4k_+}\|f_{k_1}\|_Z\|f_{k_2}\|_Z \lesssim \epsilon_1^2 \lesssim \epsilon_0.$$

- Now we estimate $A^2_{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$. Although associated phases are highly degenerated, we know that the angle of $\nabla_\xi \Phi^{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is comparable to the angle of $\nabla_\eta \Phi^{+,\nu}(\cdot,\cdot)$. For this case, we do angular decomposition as follows,

$$\big[e^{it\Lambda} A^2_{+,\nu}(u(t),u(t))\big](x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\chi_k^3} \sum_{l\geq\bar{l}} H^l_{k_1,k_2}, \quad H^l_{k_1,k_2} = \sum_{j_1\geq -k_{1,-}, j_2\geq -k_{2,-}} H^l_{k_1,k_2;j_1,j_2},$$

where the threshold $\bar{l} := 2k_-$ and

$$H^l_{k_1,k_2;j_1,j_2}, = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it\Phi^{+,\nu}(\xi,\eta)} m^2_{+,\nu}(\xi-\eta,\eta)\widehat{f_{k_1,j_1}}(t,\xi-\eta)\widehat{f^\nu_{k_2,j_2}}(t,\eta)\varphi_{\bar{l};l}(\angle(\xi,\nu\eta))\psi_k(\xi)d\eta\Big].$$

By doing integration by parts many times in ξ, we can rule out the case when $j \geq \max\{m+l, -k-l\}+5$ and $\min\{j_1,j_2\} \leq j - \delta j$. For the case when $j \geq \max\{m+l,-k-l\}+5$ and $\min\{j_1,j_2\} \geq j-\delta j$, we can derive the following estimate from (3.15) in Lemma 3.5,

$$\sum_{j\geq\max\{(m+l),-k-l\}+5} \sum_{\min\{j_1,j_2\}\geq j-\delta j} \|H^l_{k_1,k_2;j_1,j_2}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{j\geq\max\{m+l,-k-l\}+5} \sum_{\min\{j_1,j_2\}\geq j-\delta j} 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +j}$$

$$\times 2^{-2\max\{k,l\}} 2^{k+l/2} 2^{-2\alpha k_1 - 12k_+ - j_1 - j_2}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{(1-2\alpha-2\delta)k/2-6k_+}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim \epsilon_0.$$

We split the case when $j \leq \max\{m+l, -k-l\}+5$ into several cases as follows.

Case 1: If $l = \bar{l}$ and $k \geq -m/5$, then $j \leq m+\bar{l}+5 = m+2k_- +5$ and $|\Phi^{+,\nu}(\xi,\eta)| \gtrsim 2^{3k} \gtrsim 2^{-3m/5}$. From (3.21) in Lemma 3.6, we have

$$\sum_{j\leq m+\bar{l}+5} \|H^{\bar{l}}_{k_1,k_2}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +j} 2^{-2k} 2^{-m-\alpha k-4k_+} 2^{(1-\alpha)k-6k_+}\|f_{k_1}\|_Z\|f_{k_2}\|_Z \lesssim 2^{(1-\alpha)k-4k_+}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim \epsilon_0.$$

Case 2: If $l = \bar{l}$, $k \leq -m/5$, then $j \leq -k-\bar{l} = -3k$. From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5 and (5.20) and (5.22) in Lemma 5.4, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{j\leq -3k} \|H^{\bar{l}}_{k_1,k_2}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+6k_+ +j} 2^{-2\max\{k_-,\bar{l}\}} 2^{2k+\bar{l}}\|\widehat{f_{k_1}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi}\|f_{k_2}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{\alpha k+10\delta m}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-10\delta m}\epsilon_0.$$

Case 3**:** If $l > \bar{l}$, $k + 2l \leq -m + 4\beta m$, then $j \leq -k - l + 4\beta m + 5$ and $k \leq -m/5 + \beta m$. From (3.15) in Lemma 3.5 and (5.20) and (5.22) in Lemma 5.4, the following estimate holds,

$$\|H^{l}_{k_1,k_2}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{\alpha k + 6k_+ + j} 2^{-2\max\{k_-,l\}} 2^{2k+l} \|\widehat{f_{k_1}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} \|f_{k_2}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{\alpha k + 10\delta m}\epsilon_1^2 \lesssim 2^{-10\delta m}\epsilon_0.$$

Case 4**:** If $l > \bar{l}$, $k + 2l \geq -m + 4\beta m$, then $j \leq m + l + 5$ and $\max\{k, l\} \geq -m/3 + 2\beta m$. Note that,

$$|\nabla_\eta \Phi^{+,+}(\xi,\eta)| \geq 2^{-k_+/2}\angle(\xi - \eta, \eta) \geq 2^{-k_+/2+l}, \quad |\Phi^{+,+}(\xi,\eta)| \gtrsim 2^{k+2\max\{k_-,l\}} \gtrsim 2^{m-4\beta m}.$$

As $k + 2l \geq -m + 4\beta m$ and $\angle(\xi, \nu\eta) \sim 2^l$, we can do integration by parts in “η” many times to rule out the case when $\max\{j_1, j_2\} \leq m + l - k_+/2 - 10\delta m$. It remains to consider the case when $\max\{j_1, j_2\} \geq m + l - k_+/2 - 10\delta m$. From (3.21) in Lemma 3.6, we put the input with higher spatial concentration in L^2 and the other one in L^∞. As a result, the following estimate holds,

$$\sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+l-k_+/2-10\delta m} \|H^{l}_{k_1,k_2;j_1,j_2}\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{\max\{j_1,j_2\}\geq m+l-k_+/2-10\delta m} 2^{\alpha k + j + 6k_+}$$

$$\times 2^{-2\max\{k_-,l\}} 2^{-m-\alpha k - 3k_+} 2^{-\max\{j_1,j_2\} - \alpha k - 6k_+} \|f_{k_1,j_1}\|_Z \|f_{k_1,j_2}\|_Z \lesssim 2^{-m/3 + \alpha m - 2k_+}\epsilon_0.$$

As there are at most m^3 number of cases if $l > \bar{l}$, from above estimates, it is easy to see our desired estimate (5.6) in Lemma 5.1 holds. □

8. REMAINDER ESTIMATE

This section is devoted to prove Proposition 5.2. Intuitively speaking, we can prove Proposition 5.2 by the following three steps:

(i) we can first decompose the remainder term $\mathcal{R}$ into two parts: cubic type terms and terms depend on $\Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi]$. Cubic type terms can be easily estimated.
(ii) To estimate the $Z-$ norm of the profile of $\Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi]$, it's sufficient to estimate the profile of $\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]$ in the $L^\infty_z Z$–normed space, which can be done by a fixed point type argument.
(iii) We can group all information together to prove Proposition 5.2.

Step (i) is straightforward, recall (3.10), we have

$$\mathcal{R} = \Lambda_{\geq 3}[(1 + |\nabla h|^2)B(h)\psi] + i\Lambda\Lambda_{\geq 3}[(1 + |\nabla h|^2)(B(h)\psi)^2] = \Lambda_{\geq 3}[(1 + |\nabla h|^2)(\Lambda_{\leq 2}[B(h)\psi]$$

$$+ \Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi])] + i\Lambda\Lambda_{\geq 3}[(1 + |\nabla h|^2)(\Lambda_{\leq 2}[B(h)\psi] + \Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi])^2] = I_{\text{cubic}} + I_{\text{fps}},$$

where

$$I_{\text{cubic}} = |\nabla h|^2\Lambda_{\leq 2}[B(h)\psi] + i\Lambda\Big(|\nabla h|^2(\Lambda_{\leq 2}[B(h)\psi])^2 + (\Lambda_2[B(h)\psi])^2 + 2\Lambda_2[B(h)\psi]\Lambda_1[B(h)\psi]\Big), \tag{8.1}$$

$$I_{\text{fps}} = (1 + |\nabla h|^2)\Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi] + i\Lambda\Big((1 + |\nabla h|^2)(\Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi])^2$$

$$+ 2(1 + |\nabla h|^2)(\Lambda_{\leq 2}[B(h)\psi])(\Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi])\Big). \tag{8.2}$$

Since we already know the explicit formula of $\Lambda_{\leq 2}[B(h)\psi]$. That is to say (8.1) can be explicitly represented in terms of h and ψ. Intuitively speaking, we can rewrite (8.1) as follows,

$$I_{\text{cubic}} = \sum_{\mu,\nu,\tau\in\{+,-\}} C_{\mu,\nu,\tau}(u^\mu, u^\nu, u^\tau) + C'_{\mu,\nu}(u^\mu, u^\nu, h_1) + C_\mu(u^\mu, h_2, h_3) + C(h_4, h_5, h_6). \tag{8.3}$$

where h_i, $1 \leq i \leq 6$, denotes some quadratic term in terms of u and $\bar{u}$. They can be represented as follows,

$$h_i = \sum_{\mu,\nu\in\{+,-\}} T^i_{\mu,\nu}(u^\mu, u^\nu), \quad 1 \leq i \leq 6.$$

Proof of Proposition 5.2 . Recall (2.12) and (2.13). From (8.10) in Lemma 8.2, we have

$$\sup_{1\leq i\leq 6}\ \sup_{t\in[2^{m-1},2^{m+1}]} \|e^{it\Lambda} h_i\|_Z \lesssim \epsilon_0.$$

From above estimate and estimates (8.12), (8.13), and (8.14) in Lemma 8.2, the following estimate holds for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\theta \in [0,1]$, and $t, t_1, t_2 \in [2^{m-1}, 2^{m+1}]$,

$$\|e^{it\Lambda}\big[I_{\text{cubic}}\big]\|_Z + 2^{-(1-\theta)k+\theta m}\|P_k\big(e^{it\Lambda}\big[I_{\text{cubic}}\big]\big)\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0,$$

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}, j\geq \max\{-k,0\}} 2^{\delta j}\|\int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{it\Lambda}\big[I_{\text{cubic}}\big]dt\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{-\delta m}\epsilon_0.$$

From $L^2 - L^2 - L^\infty$ type trilinear estimate (3.3) in Lemma 3.1, we put the input with the medium frequency in L^∞ and the other inputs in L^2, as a result, the following estimate holds,

$$\sup_{t\in[2^{m-1},2^m]} \|\widehat{I_{\text{cubic}}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} \lesssim 2^{-m}\sum_{1\leq i\leq 6}\big(\|u\|_Z + \|h_i\|_Z\big)^3 \lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0. \tag{8.4}$$

Combing above estimates with estimates (8.5) and (8.6), it's easy to see Proposition 5.2 holds. □

8.1. $Z-$ **norm estimate of terms depend on** $\Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi]$**.** In this subsection, we mainly do step (ii). More precisely, we have the following lemma,

Lemma 8.1. *Under the bootstrap assumption*(2.12) *and the improved energy estimate* (2.13)*, the following estimates hold for any* $k \in \mathbb{Z}$*,* $\theta \in [0,1]$*, and* $t, t_1, t_2 \in [2^{m-1}, 2^{m+1}]$*,*

$$\|e^{it\Lambda}\big[I_{\text{fps}}\big]\|_Z + 2^{-(1-\theta)k+\theta m}\|P_k\big(e^{it\Lambda}\big[I_{\text{fps}}\big]\big)\|_{L^2} + \|\widehat{I_{\text{fps}}}(t,\xi)\|_{L^\infty_\xi} \lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0, \tag{8.5}$$

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}, j\geq \max\{-k,0\}} 2^{\delta j}\|\int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{it\Lambda}\big[I_{\text{fps}}\big]dt\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{-\delta m}\epsilon_0. \tag{8.6}$$

Proof. To estimate the Z-norm of $\Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi]$, it is sufficient to estimate the $L^\infty_z Z$-norm of $\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]$. Recall (2.10). To see structure of the profile of $\tilde{h}_i$ for $i \in \{1,2\}$, we define

$$\tilde{u}_1 = \tilde{h}_1 + i2\Lambda\psi, \quad \tilde{u}_2 = \tilde{h}_2 + i\Lambda\psi,$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{h}_1 = \frac{2h+h^2}{(1+h)^2} \Longrightarrow \tilde{u}_1 &= 2u - \frac{3h}{2}\frac{2h+h^2}{(1+h)^2} - \frac{h^3}{2(1+h)^2} \\
&= 2u - \frac{3(u+\bar{u})}{4}\frac{\tilde{u}_1 + \overline{\tilde{u}_1}}{2} - \frac{(u+\bar{u})}{4}\Big(\frac{\tilde{u}_2 + \overline{\tilde{u}_2}}{2}\Big)^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

$$\tilde{h}_2 = \frac{h}{1+h} \Longrightarrow \tilde{u}_2 = u - h\frac{h}{1+h} = u - \frac{(u+\bar{u})(\tilde{u}_2 + \overline{\tilde{u}_2})}{4}. \tag{8.8}$$

With above discussions, we can easily transfer the fixed point type formulation (2.10) into a fixed point type formulation in terms of u, $\bar{u}$, $\tilde{u}_i$ and $\overline{\tilde{u}_i}$, $i \in \{1,2\}$.

Before estimating $\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]$, we need to know the Z–norm of the profile of $\tilde{u}_i$. From (8.7) and (8.8), we have following estimate by using the main results in Lemma 8.2,

$$\sum_{i=1,2}\|e^{it\Lambda}\tilde{u}_i\|_Z \lesssim \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_1 \sum_{i=1,2}\|e^{it\Lambda}\tilde{u}_i\|_Z, \Longrightarrow \sum_{i=1,2}\|e^{it\Lambda}\tilde{u}_i\|_Z \lesssim \epsilon_1.$$

Now we are ready to prove Lemma 8.1. From estimates (8.12), (8.13), and (8.14) in Lemma 8.2, and Hölder type estimates, we can derive the following estimate from (2.10),

$$\|e^{it\Lambda}\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]\|_{L^\infty_z Z} \lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1\|e^{it\Lambda}\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]\|_{L^\infty_z Z},$$

$$2^{-(1-\theta)k+\theta m}\|P_k[\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]]\|_{L^\infty_z L^2} \lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0 + \epsilon_0\|e^{it\Lambda}[\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]]\|_{L^\infty_z Z},$$

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}, j\geq -k_-} 2^{\delta j}\|\int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{it\Lambda}\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]\|_{L^\infty_z B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{-\delta m}\epsilon_0 + 2^{3m/2}\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|P_k[\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]]\|_{L^\infty_z L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\delta m}\epsilon_0.$$

In above estimate, we used the fact that $j \leq m + 100\delta m$ and used $L^2 - L^\infty$ type estimate for all quartic and higher order terms in (2.10). Above estimates further imply the following estimates hold,

$$\begin{aligned}\|e^{it\Lambda}\Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi]\|_Z + 2^{-(1-\theta)k+\theta m}\|P_k[B(h)\psi]\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|e^{it\Lambda}\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]\|_{L^\infty_z Z}\\ &+ 2^{-(1-\theta)k+\theta m}\|P_k[\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]]\|_{L^\infty_z L^2} \lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0. \qquad (8.9)\\ \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}, j\geq -k_-} 2^{\delta j}\|\int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{it\Lambda}\Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h)\psi]\|_{L^\infty_z B_{k,j}} &\lesssim 2^{-\delta m}\epsilon_0.\end{aligned}$$

$$\|\Lambda_{\geq 3}[B(h,\psi)]\|_{L^\infty_\xi} \lesssim \|\widehat{\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]}\|_{L^\infty_z L^\infty_\xi} \lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0 + \epsilon_0\|e^{it\Lambda}\Lambda_{\geq 3}[\nabla_{x,z}\varphi]\|_{L^\infty_z Z} \lesssim 2^{-m}\epsilon_0.$$

Following the same procedure, recall (8.2), it's easy to see our desired estimates (8.5) and (8.6) hold. □

Lemma 8.2. *For any $\mu,\nu,\kappa \in \{+,-\}$ and f, g,$h \in H^{N_0}\cap Z$, which satisfy the following estimates,*

$$\|f\|_{H^{N_0}} + \|g\|_{H^{N_0}} + \|h\|_{H^{N_0}} \leq A, \quad \|f\|_Z + \|g\|_Z + \|h\|_Z \leq B,$$

we have following estimates for any $t, t_1, t_2 \in [2^{m-1}, 2^{m+1}]$ and $\theta \in [0,1]$,

$$\|e^{it\Lambda}Q((e^{-it\Lambda}f)^\mu, (e^{-it\Lambda}g)^\nu)\|_Z \lesssim B^2 + 2^{-10\delta m}(A+B)^2, \qquad (8.10)$$

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-(1-\theta)k}\|P_k\big[e^{it\Lambda}Q((e^{-it\Lambda}f)^\mu, (e^{-it\Lambda}g)^\nu)\big]\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\theta m}B^2. \qquad (8.11)$$

$$\|e^{it\Lambda}C\big((e^{-it\Lambda}f)^\mu, (e^{-it\Lambda}g)^\nu, (e^{-it\Lambda}h)^\kappa\big)\|_Z \lesssim 2^{-m}B^2 + 2^{-m-10\delta m}(A+B)^2, \qquad (8.12)$$

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-(1-\theta)k}\|P_k\big[e^{it\Lambda}C\big((e^{-it\Lambda}f)^\mu, (e^{-it\Lambda}g)^\nu, (e^{-it\Lambda}h)^\kappa\big)\big]\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{-(1+\theta)m}B^3, \qquad (8.13)$$

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}, j\geq\max\{-k,0\}} 2^{\delta j}\|\int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{it\Lambda}C\big((e^{-it\Lambda}f)^\mu, (e^{-it\Lambda}g)^\nu, (e^{-it\Lambda}h)^\kappa\big)dt\|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim 2^{-10\delta m}(A+B)^3, \quad (8.14)$$

where the symbol $q(\xi-\eta,\eta)$ of bilinear operator $Q(\cdot,\cdot)$ and the symbol $c(\xi-\eta,\eta-\sigma,\sigma)$ of trilinear operator $C(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ satisfy the following estimates respectively,

$$\|q(\xi-\eta,\eta)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2}} \lesssim 2^{4\max\{k_1,k_2\}_+}, \qquad (8.15)$$

$$\|c(\xi-\eta,\eta-\sigma,\sigma)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty_{k,k_1,k_2,k_3}} \lesssim 2^{4\max\{k_1,k_2,k_3\}_+}. \qquad (8.16)$$

Proof. • We first prove estimate (8.11) and (8.13). We only prove (8.11) in details here. (8.13) can be proved very similarly. From bilinear estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.1 and (5.20) in Lemma 5.4, the following estimate holds for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and any $\theta \in [0,1]$,

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-(1-\theta)k} \| P_k \big[e^{it\Lambda} Q((e^{-it\Lambda} f)^{\mu}, (e^{-it\Lambda} g)^{\nu}) \big] \|_{L^2} \lesssim \sum_{k_2 \leq k_1 - 10} 2^{-(1-\theta)k_1 + 4k_{1,+}} \big[\| e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1} \|_{L^\infty} \| g_{k_2} \|_{L^2}$$

$$+ \| e^{-it\Lambda} g_{k_1} \|_{L^\infty} \| f_{k_2} \|_{L^2} \big] + \sum_{|k_2 - k_1| \leq 10} 2^{-(1-\theta)k + (1-\theta)k + 4k_{1,+}} \| e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1} \|_{L^\infty}^{\theta} \| f_{k_1} \|_{L^2}^{(1-\theta)} \| g_{k_2} \|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\theta m} B^2.$$

• Now we proceed to prove estimate (8.10) and (8.12). The proof of (8.12) is very similar, we only estimate (8.10) in details here. Through doing integration by parts in "ξ" many times, we can rule out the case when $j \geq m+5$. It remains to consider the case when $j \leq m+5$. Intuitively speaking, our desired estimates follow straightforwardly from $L^2 - L^\infty$ type estimate. However, as the symbols have certain derivatives, we only need to get around this issue.

We first do dyadic decomposition and spatial localization for two inputs. Without loss of generality, we assume that $k_2 \leq k_1$. When $k_1 - k_2 \geq 5$, $k_2 \geq -2m/3$, $0 \leq k_1 \leq 2\beta m$, we do integration by parts in "η" many times to rule out the case when $\max\{j_1, j_2\} \leq m - 10\beta m$. As a result, we have

$$\sum_{j \leq m+5} \| e^{it\Lambda} Q((e^{-it\Lambda} f)^{\mu}, (e^{-it\Lambda} g)^{\nu}) \|_{B_{k,j}} \lesssim \sum_{j \leq m+5} 2^{\alpha k + j + 6k_+} \Big(\sum_{|k_1 - k_2| \leq 5, \text{ or } k_1 \leq 0} 2^{4k_{1,+}} \| e^{-it\Lambda} f_{k_1} \|_{L^\infty}$$

$$\times \| g_{k_2} \|_{L^2} + \big(\sum_{k_2 \leq -2m/3, k_2 \leq k_1} + \sum_{k_1 \geq 2\beta m, k_2 \leq k_1} \big) 2^{4k_{1,+}} \| f_{k_1} \|_{L^2} 2^{k_2} \| g_{k_2} \|_{L^2} + 2^{-10m} (A+B)^2$$

$$+ \sum_{k_2 \geq -2m/3, 0 \leq k_1 \leq 2\beta m} \sum_{\max\{j_1, j_2\} \geq m - 10\beta m} 2^{4k_{1,+}} 2^{-m - \max\{j_1, j_2\} - \alpha k_1 - \alpha k_2} \| f_{k_1, j_1} \|_Z \| g_{k_2, j_2} \|_Z \Big)$$

$$\lesssim B^2 + 2^{-10\delta m} (A+B)^2.$$

• Now, we proceed to prove (8.14). The major difference between (8.13) and (8.14) is that now we can take the advantage of the oscillation in time. From the straightforward $L^2 - L^\infty - L^\infty$ type estimate, we only need to consider the case where all frequencies are like "1" and all inputs are spatially concentrated around "1". The strategies for those cases are already discussed in subsubsection 7.3.1. We omit details here. □

REFERENCES

[1] T. Alazard and J. M. Delort. Global solutions and asymptotic behavior for two dimensional gravity water waves, **2013**, *arXiv:1305.4090v1, preprint.*

[2] T. Alarzard, N. Burq and C. Zuily. On the water wave equations with surface tension, *Duke Math. J.*, 158 (**2011**), no. 3, 413–499.

[3] T. Alazard, N. Burq and C. Zuily, On the Cauchy problem for the gravity water waves, *Invent. Math.*, 198 (**2014**), no. 1, 71–163.

[4] B. Alvarez-Samaniego and D. Lannes. Large time existence for 3D water waves and asymptotics, *Invent. Math.*, **171** (2008), 485–541.

[5] M. Ambrose and N. Masmoudi, The zero surface tension limit of two-dimensional water waves, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.*, 58 (**2005**), no. 10, 1287–1315,.

[6] K. Beyer and M. Günther. On the Cauchy problem for a capillary drop. I. Irrotational motion, *Math. Methods. Appl. Sci.*, 21 (**1998**), no. 12, 1149–1183,.

[7] A. Castro, D. Córdoba, C. Fefferman, F. Gancedo and J. Gómez-Serrano. Finite time singularities for the free boundary incompressible Euler equations, *Ann. of Math.*, 178 (**2013**), no. 3, 1061–1134.

[8] D. Christodoulou and H. Lindblad, On the motion of the free surface of a liquid, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 53 (**2000**), no. 12, 1536–1602.

[9] D. Coutand and S. Shkoller. Well-posedness of the free-surface incompressible Euler equations with or without surface tension, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 20 (**2007**), no. 3, 829–930.

[10] D. Coutand adn S. Shkoller. On the finite-time splash and splat singularities for the 3-D free-surface Euler equations, *Comm. Math. Phys*., 325 (**2014**), no. 1, 143–183.

[11] W. Craig, C. Sulem and P.-L. Sulem. Nonlinear modulation of gravity waves: a rigorous approach, *Nonlinearity*, 5 (**1992**), no. 2, 497–522,.

[12] S. Deng and S-M. Sun. Exact theory of three dimensional water waves at the critical speed. *Siam J. Math. Anal.*, 42 (**2010**), no. 6, 2721–2761.

[13] Y. Deng, A.Ionescu, B. Pausader and F. Pusateri. Global solutions of the gravity-capillary water wave system in 3 dimensions, *arXiv:1601.05686*, *preprint*.

[14] C. Fefferman, A. Ionescu and V. Lie. On the absence of "splash" singularities in the case of two-fluid interfaces, *to appear in Duke. Math. J.*

[15] P. Germain, N. Masmoudi and J. Shatah. Global solutions for the gravity surface water waves equation in dimension 3, *Ann. of Math*., 175 (**2012**), no. 2, 691–754.

[16] P. Germain, N. Masmoudi and J. Shatah. Gobal solutions for capillary waves equation in 3D, *to appear in Comm. Pure Appl. Math*.

[17] Y. Guo and B. Pausader. Global smooth ion dynamics in the Euler-Poisson system, *Comm. Math. Phys.,* 303 (**2011**), 89-125.

[18] Z. Guo, L. Peng and B. Wang. Decay estimates for a class of wave equations, *J. Func, Anal.*, 254(**2008**), no. 6, 1642–1660.

[19] J. Hunter, M. Ifrim and D. Tataru. Two dimensional water waves in holomorphic coordinates, *arXiv:1401.1252*.

[20] M. Ifrim and D. Tataru. Two dimensional water waves in holomorphic coordinates II: global solutions, *arXiv:1404.7583*.

[21] M. Ifrim and D. Tataru. The lifespan of small data solutions in two dimensional capillary water wave, *arXiv:1406.5471*.

[22] A. Ionescu and B. Pausader. The Euler-Poisson system in 2D: global stability of the constant equilibrium solution, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2013 (**2013**), 761–826.

[23] A. Ionescu and F. Pusateri. Global solution for the gravity water wave system in 2D, *to appear in Invent. Math*.

[24] A. Ionescu and F. Pusateri. Global analysis of a model for capillary water waves in 2D, *arXiv:1406.6042*.

[25] A. Ionescu and F. Pusateri. Global regularity for 2d water waves with surface tension, *arXiv:1408.4428*.

[26] F. John. Blow up of solutions of nonlinear wave equations in three space dimensions, Manuscripta Math, **28**(1979), no, 1–3, pp 235–268.

[27] D. Lannes, Well-posedness of the water waves equations, *J. Amer. Math. Soc*., 18 (**2005**), no. 3, 605–654.

[28] H. Lindblad, Well-posedness for the motion of an incompressible liquid with free surface boundary, *Ann. of Math*., 162 (**2005**), no. 1, 109–194.

[29] V.I. Nalimov, The Cauchy-Poisson problem, *Dinamika Splosn. Sredy Vyp*. 18 Dinamika Zidkost. so Svobod. Granicami 254 (**1974**), 10–210.

[30] J. Shatah and C. Zeng. Geometry and a priori estimate for free boundary problems of the Eulers equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math*., 61 (**2008**), no. 5, 698–744.

[31] H. Yosihara. Gravity waves on the free surface of an incompressible perfect fluid of finite depth, *Publ.Res. Inst. Math. Sci*., 310 (**1982**), no. 1, 49–96.

[32] X. Wang. Global infinite energy solutions for the 2D gravity water waves system, *preprint* (2015), *arXiv:1502.00687v2*.

[33] X. Wang. On 3D water waves system above a flat bottom, *preprint* (2015), *arXiv:1508.06223*.

[34] S. Wu. Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 2-d, *Invent. Math*., 130 (**1997**), no. 1, 39–72.

[35] S. Wu. Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 3-d, *J. Amer. Math. Soc*., 12 (**1999**), no. 2, 445–495.

[36] S. Wu. Almost global wellposedness of the 2-D full water wave problem, *Invent. Math*., 177 (**2009**), no. 1, 45–135.

[37] S. Wu. Global wellposedness of the 3-D full water wave problem, *Invent. Math*., 184 (**2011**), no. 1, 125–220.

[38] V. Zakharov. Stability of periodic waves of finite amplitude on the surface of a deep fluid. *J. Appl. Mech. Tech. Phys.*, 9(**1968**), no. 2, 190–194, .

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY,08544, USA
E-mail address: `xuecheng@math.princeton.edu`